33/01/C/1

A XXXIII C

Highly interesting medico - historico - litterary work against homoepathy. Cont. a.o.: Historical and biographical sketch of the homoeopathic doctrine and of Hahnemann. **Copy with autograph dedication.**

To his respected friend

Dr Welzler at Aix-la-Chapelle

by the author

52668

REMARKS

ON

THE ABRACADABRA

OF THE

Nineteenth Century;

OR ON

Dr. SAMUEL HAHNEMANN'S

HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICINE,

WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO

Dr. CONSTANTINE HERING'S

"CONCISE VIEW OF THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICINE,"
Philadelphia, 1833.

BY

WILLIAM LEO-WOLF, M.D.

When thus ripe lies are to perfection sprung,
Full grown and fit to grace a mortal tongue,
Thro' thousand vents impatient forth they flow,
And rush in millions on the world below.—Pope.

NEW-YORK:

1835.

PUBLISHED BY CAREY, LEA AND BLANCHARD, IN PHILADELPHIA.

WELLCOME
HISTORICAL
MEDICAL
LIBRARY

ENTERED according to Act of Congress, in the year 1835, by WILLIAM LEO-WOLF, M. D. in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District of New-York.

PRINTED BY GEORGE P. SCOTT & CO. ANN STREET, NEW-YORK.

PREFACE.

The only probable reason for the long continuance of those prejudices and superstitions which are not sustained by the interests of large privileged classes of society, is, that when intelligent men know the tenets of a doctrine to be inconsistent and false, they do not think it worth while to examine it minutely, but leave the subject to the weak-minded and credulous, who, considering silence or mere satire as an indirect admission of their extravagant and fanciful conceptions, generally become firmer in their belief and bolder in their public conduct. This appears also the principal reason why homœopathia has existed so long.

Adverse to controversy, the author of these remarks never thought of expressing publicly his opinion of homœopathia until towards the end of the last year, when he accidentally became acquainted with Dr. Hering's "Concise View of the rise and progress of the homœo-" pathic doctrine." He then clearly saw that the votaries of this medical superstition had selected the United States as the most propitious field for its propagation, and that they would leave no stone unturned to prepossess the public in their favor.

Aware of the benefits to be derived by his adopted country, from a faithful exposition of this new medical doctrine, the original works of which are inaccessible to those unacquainted with the German language; the author was instigated to this tedious task by the desire also of vindicating the literary honor of Germany, his native country, so much abused by the false reports of the persecutions which Hahnemann had to suffer there for truth's sake, of the high respect which he now enjoys as a man and as a reformer of medicine, and by

the wrong statements in regard to the large number of her distinguished physicians, said to have zealously adopted this mode of treatment.

The following remarks were written merely as a review, and were at first intended for an American medical periodical. As they did not appear in that form, the author lately yielded to the repeated wishes of his professional friends, collected the fragments, and now offers them in their present form. The original destination of these remarks, the great difficulties of writing in a foreign idiom, of correcting the manuscript, and many other reasons, will explain the non-observance of a strict logical order, the occurrence of frequent repetitions, the long and numerous notes, and other defects, for which the kind indulgence of the reader is humbly requested. The author must state that a part of these defects is to be attributed also to the hope, cherished to the last moment, of being released from this publication by the abler pen of some American colleague. And indeed, it is difficult to comprehend, why such a pamphlet as the Concise View, could have been circulated for upwards of eighteen months in a populous and enlightened city, possessing a celebrated university, and so many distinguished professional men, without any pertinent public censure; and it must appear still more strange, that in this city likewise, such a disgraceful publication as that contained in the New-York Commercial Advertiser of the 7th of February last, and which will be mentioned hereafter, could also have remained unnoticed.—It cannot be justly expected that well educated physicians and medical authors should be constantly warring against all kinds of charlatanism. Common quackery claims not to be founded on scientific principles, it merely demands implicit belief in its arcana usually recommended for special cases only, and does not, therefore, directly involve misconceptions of a general character in regard to the

healing art; hence, the injury done by it, is confined to the credulity of individuals who, if they are disappointed, must suffer the natural consequences of all imprudence. But when charlatanism adopts the features of a medical system, and pretends to reform the healing art, by rejecting the fundamental principles of the human intellect and the truths of all experience hitherto acknowledged, by inventing supernatural powers, under the term laws of nature, and by relying on false statements and illusory facts; and when its adherents, either from ignorance and self-deception, or from egotism and self-interest, palm upon the public, under the cloak of philanthropy and professional zeal, the grossest misconceptions, and the most noxious superstitions; then the injury can easily increase to an alarming extent before the public is undeceived, and it then becomes the imperative duty of the profession frankly to state the true facts, and to explain the true bearings of so important a subject.

The author would farther state, that he has never read one of the different German publications in opposition to Hahnemannism, except some few lines of a review of the Pseudomessias Medicus, written by one of his former respected colleagues, Doctor Simon, junior, at Hamburg, and published in the Allgemeine Medizinishe Annalen, (Feb. 1832), of his distinguished friend, Professor Hecker, at Berlin; he has merely seen their titles in the Leipzig book-catalogues, and is therefore ignorant whether he has taken the same ground with other opposers of Hahnemann's, or not. It appears from the title of the work mentioned, and similar ones subsequently published by Dr. Simon, that this learned author has dipped his pen principally in the ink of ridicule and satire. Though this course is almost inevitable to any one who writes against Hahnemannism, a subject of such vital importance should, however, be examined differently; particularly as the discussions which homœopathia, like similar su-

perstitions, excite, are so intimately connected with the most subtile investigations in the natural sciences and metaphysics, that they offer inexhaustible means for a rational polemic. The author who advocates truth should also remember, that it will never be sufficient merely to ridicule and to despise such subjects, however ridiculous and contemptible they may be. Rational arguments, derived from the impartial scrutiny of experience, are, if any, the only ones, capable of successfully combating the general predilection of man for the extraordinary and miraculous, and of destroying the noxious influence of sophisms and prejudices, rooted in ignorance and extravagant fancy, or in the implicit belief of naked and delusive facts.

The author has also briefly alluded to some topics, which, though not directly connected with homœopathia, appear to him worth noticing as erroneous conceptions and obnoxious prejudices still existing among the profession and the public. He wishes, however, that these remarks may be considered only as the abstract of his individual researches and experience, which he thought his duty not to withhold, as they might, even if he should be in the wrong, call forth an exchange of opinions on these important subjects, which would benefit the public and the profession.

In conclusion, the author will state that he will meet all objections which may be made to his remarks in a scientific and dignified manner; if proffered in any other mode, they will remain unanswered.—" Et refellere " sine pertinacia, et refelli sine iracundia parati su- " mus."—*Cicero.*

New-York, *December*, 1834.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Historical and biographical sketch of the homœopathic doctrine and of Hahnemann	9
Remarks on Dr. Hering's reproach of the incapability and dishonesty of the apothecaries at Leipzig, and on the state of pharmacy in Germany	34
Fragmentary remarks on the present state of practical medicine and surgery	46
On the homœopathic doctrine generally	58
The three fundamental maxims of homœopathia in general	61
Results of experiments with simple drugs on healthy persons	62
The homœopathic "law of nature," or the maxim, similia similibus curantur	75
Hahnemann's "great truth," that itch is the only cause of all chronic diseases	166
The third hemœopathic maxim, or that it is impossible to administer too small a dose of a drug	179
Medical virtues developed from all natural substances, and especially from simple drugs	181
The energy of solutions of medicinal substances excessively increased by their transmission from place to place	228
Direful consequences of the homœopathic superstition if generally adopted	237
Homœopathia contradicted by Hahnemann's earlier public statements, his later retractions, etc.	239
Conclusion	253

EXPLANATION OF THE VIGNETTE.

The "*old philosopher*," sitting in the magic diagram, proclaims to the world the charm of his discovered "*law of nature*" written in the inverse shape of the old *Abracadabra*, (see page 262) and containing the same uneven number of letters,—"numero deus impare gaudet," —Virg. Buccol. He is just engaged in developing *spirits* from a simple drug by trituration, as is clearly seen by a very large and fiery one—"ignea inest illis vis"—which is escaping from the mortar at the command of his magic wand, and which, on account of its size, appears to belong, at least, to the sixtieth potenz.—The negro, thankful for the gratifying prospects of his physical emancipation, which has already happily succeeded with one half of his sooty skin, assists the "*great benefactor of mankind*" in his "*gigantic work*," and developes the thirtieth potenz from table salt, by shaking "*from above downwards*."—It appears his zeal actuated him too much, and that he has shaken, contrary to the directions of the "*great reformer*," too violently and too often, as numerous spirits rush out of the vial. One of them, probably in consequence of his particularly *glorified* antipsoric nature, gets hold of the great cross of the order of the ITCH, which, it is rumoured, has lately been created by the great magician, in spite of the "*bayonets of the kings and princes of Europe*;" and is reserved particularly as a munificent reward for the arduous zeal of his missionaries, in propagating the "*great truth*," in "*Egypt the land of monsters and the sanguinary gold coast*," and particularly in America.—The emblems of all the "*learned lumber*" of the healing art, accumulated for scores of centuries, have "*fallen to the ground*;" the stick of Æsculapius as well as the scutcheon of Minerva are broken to pieces; and even the favorite bird of Athene, which so long has been her faithful companion, is dead;—"nequidquam seros exercet noctua cantus,"—Virg. Georg. It died however, not from the hellebore, which luxuriantly grows around the mysterious grotto, without any remedial effect: but of grief, at seeing the new mathematical principles, and the other marvellous reforms of the competitor of "*Galileo and Harvey*:"

- - - Ille suæ contra non immemor artis,
Omnia transformat sese in miracula rerum.—*Virg. Georg.*

REMARKS ON HOMŒOPATHIA,

&c., &c.

Although the doctrine of Hahnemann, or the homœopathic doctrine has within the last few years been adopted in this country as the leading principle of medical practice by some respectable physicians; it has, however, remained unknown to the mass of the medical profession, and has been but little noticed by the medical periodicals.

The task of introducing this doctrine to the American public has devolved upon Dr. Constantine Hering, of Philadelphia, who, in his pamphlet entitled "A concise view of the rise and progress of homœopathic medicine," Philadelphia, 1833, has given a brief sketch of this remarkable literary phenomenon of the present age.

So long as any doctrine or practice of the healing art remains the rule of individual practitioners only, no one has a right to criticize it publicly; but if this doctrine is promulgated in such a manner as to mislead, and even to injure, the young medical student as well as the public, it then becomes the imperative duty of every man, who believes the whole doctrine to be founded upon the grossest errors and contradictions, and who knows facts which differ widely from the statements published, not to withhold the truth, and to examine the subject by the tests of reason and experience.

In order to remove any suspicions that the following pages are more or less dictated by personal feelings, we must state, that in our present retirement we are more than ever indifferent what course of practice physicians may pursue to promote the interest of their patients or their own. Had it not been for our reluctance to appear before the public, and more especially in a controversy, we should have vindicated our native country and the honor of its professional men, on a former occasion, when one of our respected colleagues, in New-York, thought proper to honor, publicly, the homœopathic treatment of the Asiatic cholera by camphor with the term "German treatment."

We regret very much, that the author of the above mentioned pamphlet did not submit the subject scientifically to the profession alone, before addressing it to the public; and also, that he has attempted to forestall public opinion, by blending the moral and intellectual standing of the author of homoœpathia with the doctrine itself. Had his course been otherwise, the whole controversy would have been confined within the limits of a free scientific discussion, and it would not have been necessary to divest the subject of personal considerations not belonging to it, nor to dispel the halo cast over Hahnemann by his disciples and followers. As he has done this, however, without due regard to the dignity of one of the most noble and beneficial sciences and of its faithful servants, it is obvious, that studied delicacy cannot be reciprocally expected from any man, who has always been zealously attached to his profession, who is conscious of what mankind owes to the noble exertions of those distinguished in the history and literature of medicine, and who will never consent to receive, in place of the latter, a methodical charlatanism, based upon the most absurd conceptions and the rudest empiricism.

Every impartial reader of the "Concise View" must be gratified to find in the author a man of learning and of professional character. No one could object to his zeal for adopting the homœopathic doctrine, and for introducing it into this country. The pursuit of such high objects as the health and life of his fellow-men, must claim indulgence for every one, and especially for him who devotes himself to the healing art, even if his scientific views, whether original or embraced from other sources, should be contradictory to common sense and to the experience of the most eminent men of this and former ages. How many men of the greatest attainments in particular sciences and arts, and of the purest moral character, have believed and even now admit things incompatible with the laws of human intellect, and contrary to all experience! How numerous the confirmations of Cicero's remark, "Nihil tam absurde dici potest, quod non dicatur ab aliquo "philosophorum!" But if a man is so led away by his zeal, or by any other motives, as to publish for facts, statements which are erroneous, and by which the public mind may easily be misguided, concerning such valuable and irreparable objects as life and health; then, the most charitable conjecture is his want of true information on the subject.

It is a very remarkable, and in fact a characteristic feature of the homœopathic doctrine, that most of its followers, and also the author of the concise view, are obliged, in its support, to disregard not only all medical knowledge hitherto considered as highly valuable by the profession; but to proclaim its inventor, Samuel Hahnemann, the greatest philosopher, the first medical genius of every age, and almost a saint. It appears as if they felt their doctrine to be inconsistent with every law of the human understanding, and endeavored to compensate for its contradictions and defects by representing Hahnemann as a martyr for truth, by canonizing him though yet alive, and by making his suggestions and tenets the objects of implicit faith and worship.—But what has a medical doctrine, or any other scientific hypothesis, to do with the character of its founder? Francis Bacon says very correctly in his Organon: "Pessima enim res est errorum apotheosis, et pro "peste intellectus habenda est, si vanis accedit veneratio." Kepler's and Newton's immensely valuable discoveries would be equally esteemed, had their characters as men been less pious and moral. The life of Francis Bacon, whom we have just quoted, was by no means pure, still *his* Organon and his other writings have lasted for centuries; and will ever be known as the master works of the human intellect.* John Brown's intemperate habits were known to all his followers, yet this did not prevent the adoption and extension of his doctrine.

On the first page of his pamphlet, we read with the greatest astonishment the following: "He† who had himself never assumed "an offensive attitude, and the truth of whose doctrines only could "with propriety be combated, ought to have been treated with due

* As Dr. Hering seems to compare, also, the absurdities and ravings of his "great medical genius," with this master work of Francis Bacon above mentioned, (see l. c. p. 6.) we shall quote many passages of this and the other works of this truly great reformer of all natural sciences, who so gallantly combated the scholastic philosophy, this mother of doctrines equally superstitious, and similar to those of Hahnemann. If homœopathists had ever read and understood *one* page of Bacon's Organon, they would never have been so childish as to believe, that Hahnemann's Organon must be equally valuable, because he was bold enough to give to his miserable patch-work the same title, under the foolish impression that it will reform medicine; they would then also know, that no man was more cautious against all delusions of the senses, and all the mistakes and false conclusions, arising from false conceptions, than Francis Bacon; and that he was always particularly anxious to recommend the minute investigation of the *causes* of phenomena, saying, "recte ponitur: vere scire esse per causas scire." A maxim so much ridiculed and despised by Hahnemann and his followers!

† He, in the language of homœopathists, always refers to Hahnemann; like the disciples of Pythagoras, they think to prove the truth of any thing, by saying "αυτος εφα." "He has said it."

"respect; which I regret to say, he did not receive at the hands of "some of the physicians in Germany." Now these things may well be stated in a country, where this whole controversy is little known, and will never be fully understood; for it is not probable that any American would undertake the tedious task of perusing all the essays published pro and con, in Germany, on this subject. Every German, however, who is well acquainted with the literary history of the age, and with the origin and progress of the homœopathic doctrine in his native country must admit, that since the time of Paracelsus, who was in many respects truly distinguished as a great medical genius, no professional author has treated the greatest physicians and medical authors of past and present ages, with less respect and more unblushing impudence than Samuel Hahnemann, though he was guilty of the grossest and repeated impositions upon the public. About the year 1800 he advertised, extensively, a new salt, the discovery of which he claimed and which he offered for sale, under the name of *alkali pneum*, at the moderate price of one louisd'or (about $4) per ounce. The society for the promotion of natural sciences at Berlin desired to become acquainted with this new substance, which, as Hahnemann stated, would exercise a great influence upon chemistry. They procured an ounce of it from his agent at Leipzig, which was analyzed by some of the greatest chemists of the age, Professors Karsten, Hermbstaedt and Klaproth; and these men pronounced it, in the transactions of that society, as nothing but *common borax*, a pound of which costs but a few cents.* Shortly afterwards, he advertised his "infallible preventive of scarlet fever," as he termed it; the price of this, also, was a louisd'or; but being disappointed in the sale thereof, he afterwards confessed it to consist of nothing but a few grains of the extract of belladonna dissolved in water; also, worth about a few cents. Who, now, we ask, would consider a man trustworthy and honorable, particularly a physician, distinguished for some knowledge and talents who, from the basest interest becomes a public impostor, and withholds from his fellow-men, even for a single hour, what he considers to be a preventive of a dangerous and frequently fatal disease, merely because poor people are unable to pay him four dollars for what costs him but a few cents? The able Professor Joerg, at Leipzig, has proved by laborious

* See the celebrated German Literary Gazette, the Jenaer Literatur-Zeitung Beylage fur 1801, No. 1.

investigations that many of the quotations from old medical authors, made by Hahnemann in support of his doctrine, are adulterated and false. Can any one confide in the veracity of such a man without the most unquestionable evidence?

The eminent talents and merits of Hahneman before he wrote upon homœopathia, are also held forth to the public, with a view to prejudice them in favour of this "new Art of Healing," as we read on pages 1 and 2 of Dr. Hering's pamphlet: "Nor were his ex-"traordinary talents, which in riper years rendered him one of the "greatest medical geniuses, unknown at that time." We are really at a loss to express the just indignation which every one, even but slightly acquainted with the history of medicine, must feel at hearing such humbuggery! About thirty-four years ago we had the good fortune to become acquainted with this "greatest medical genius," shortly after we had settled at Altona, a Danish city near Hamburg. Hahnemann intended to practise his profession at the latter place, which, being at that time without a regulated medical police, offered a large field for his arcana and other quackeries, on account of which he had already been obliged to leave several places, and to wander about in his native country, even when nearly forty-five years old. Unable to succeed at Hamburg, he left this place also, after a short stay. We well remember some conversation held with him on different professional subjects, especially on John Brown's system then in vogue, in which, however, he not only displayed no extraordinary acquirements or talents, but without mentioning any results of his homœopathic doctrine, the same shallowness of judgment and propensity to mysteries and absurdities, which have distinguished him through his whole life. Although at that time he had been known for upwards of twenty-four years as a good scholar, as the translator of several works from foreign languages, and also by his discoveries of the adulteration of wines by lead, the detection of poisoning by arsenic, and his mercurius solubilis, still he was never, to our knowledge, appointed a professor in any medical institution, nor was he engaged in an extensive practice; probably because he was not qualified; for at that time Germany was by no means as well provided with physicians as at present; and now there are still wealthy provinces in Prussia, where the ratio of the physicians to the population is as 1 to 7000, and in several provinces of Bohemia, as 1 to 60,000 inhabitants.* Every

*See Dr. Streintz in Medicinische Jahrbuecher des K. K. Oesterreichischen Staates

German physician, therefore, who has no particular religious or political objections to a stay in his native country, has many more chances of obtaining a large and profitable practice there, than in any other, provided he can pass the rigorous state-examinations, now established by law, independent of the academical graduation, because many medical faculties did confer the degree of Medicinæ Doctor upon ignorant individuals. Our author is, therefore, very much mistaken in saying, on p. 1, "previously to his appear-"ance as the reformer of medicine, he had been known and esteemed "as one of the most learned, accomplished and meritorious physi-"cians in Germany." Hahnemann excepted, we cannot recollect a single instance, for upwards of thirty years, where a physician of but moderate talents was obliged to travel about in search of practice; and it would require but very little knowledge of practical medicine to prove, as we shall attempt hereafter, by many passages from Hahnemann's works, that he could never have been engaged in extensive practice, although, we believe, many of his false assertions are made not from ignorance, but from his egotism and his contempt for the opinions of others. Exclusive of Hahnemann's works upon his doctrine, his other medical productions are very trivial, and composed chiefly of compilations and translations, not worthy of a "great genius," who should certainly have found other subjects in the vast extent of the natural and medical sciences to engage his elevated mind! In regard to the distinguished discoveries in chemistry, which our author claims for his master, the learned professors of this science can name no discovery or improvement, suggested by Hahnemann, except those above mentioned; two of which, the ascertaining of the adulteration of wine by lead, and of poisoning by arsenic, have proved insufficient from the progress made in analytical chemistry; and the third, his mercurius solubilis, (the very name of which is incorrect, because it is soluble neither in water nor alcohol,) is nearly the same as the mercurius cinerius Blackii or Edinburgensium, known long before his time, and proved to be a very unsafe preparation; yet, about forty years

Vol. VII. No. 1, 3, 4, for 1832. The ratio of well educated, examined and licensed surgeons, who are permitted to administer medical aid in urgent cases, is about 1 to 1500. The governments of Austria and Prussia, convinced of the importance of thoroughbred physicians, whose education embraces also a minute knowledge of all the philosophical sciences, wisely enforce the strictest qualifications for medical practitioners of a higher order, and prefer to leave many districts but scantily provided with them, rather than to entrust the lives of their people to men who, in times of extreme danger, might prove incompetent.

ago Hahnemann, with his accustomed charlatanism, asserted not only that it would destroy the very existence of all syphilitic and many other diseases, but also, that it would never salivate, which it does more than any other preparation of mercury. His causticum, which the author of the concise view is pleased to term on page 23, "a new substance discovered by Hahnemann," has proved to be a discovery something like that of his alkali pneum—nothing but an impure alkali.—Indeed, it must appear strange to every scientific man, that in our time a new substance, and especially a valuable remedy, should have remained so long unnoticed by all the chemists, and not mentioned in the large and valuable works of Thenard, Berzelius, Gmelin, or any other author on chemistry. Hahnemann is, on the contrary, so ignorant of the great progress in chemistry during the last half century, that he appears to the reader of his works, who is acquainted only with the elements of this immense science in its present state, more ignorant than an author of ages long past, who had, at least, a clear conception of Stahl's phlogiston, Meyer's acidum pingue, or of similar hypotheses and technical terms then used. Thus, in explaining his preparation of silicea (see Chronic Diseases, Vol. III. p. 208), he speaks of a "causticum" (phlogiston probably), which the natrum acquires while melting with flint, and which, combined with the oxygen of the atmosphere, generates carbonic acid, which is evidently nonsense, even according to the old phlogistic theory. He considers further the precipitated silicea to be soluble in alcohol, although it is regarded as insoluble by all other chemists. He also states that sulphur is very soluble in alcohol, while according to all chemists, it is but slightly soluble in its gaseous state, in the vapour of water, and is perfectly insoluble in alcohol or liquid water. With all this he had the unparalleled boldness and impudence to say (Chronic Dis. Vol. I. p. 183), in regard to the present state of chemistry, "The over refined chemistry of our time is yet "ignorant of the easy solubility of sulphur in alcohol, and also of "the solubility of metals and earths in the same, after they have been potenzised* ten thousand or a million times by triturition." All this nonsense is, nevertheless, considered by the infatuated

* The term "potenzised" is correlative to the expression "developed drug-virtue;" and though not often used in the English language, we are obliged to adopt it to express briefly the power alledged to be developed from the atoms of simple drugs by homœopathic manipulation, and which may be considered similar to the powers of numbers or of other signs used by mathematicians.

followers of Hahnemann, as more wise and true than the results of the minutest chemical investigations of a Humphrey Davy, Berzelius, Faraday, Gay-Lussac, &c. This "great genius" and his followers have a natural philosophy, chemistry, a materia medica, therapia, etc.; nay, even an arithmetic of their own, as we shall prove hereafter more minutely.

This however is no reasonable objection to the intrinsic value and truths of the homœopathic doctrine, since many highly interesting discoveries in almost every science, and particularly in medicine, have been made by men of inconsiderable talent, whimsical conceptions and doubtful character. An extensive practice of more than half a century often fails to promote the science; while the minute observation of a few cases only may richly enlarge it. Statements, however, unconnected with the objects in view are uncalled for, and should not be perverted in order to forestall public sentiment. This course has been pursued by Hahnemann and most of his disciples, and his opponents are therefore also compelled to tear the unmerited laurels from the head of the man, before considering the falsehood and inconsistency of his doctrine.

On page 15 of his pamphlet, Dr. Hering says, "Among the "contemporary professors of medicine, of which there were more "than two hundred, who received salaries in Germany, among all "the hospital physicians, there was not one who was induced to study "it." This assertion, supposing that Dr. Hering knew by inspiration exactly, the course of reading pursued by all these men, corresponds but little with his remarks a few lines previous: "The labors of the "Germans, who constantly and eagerly borrow all that is most "valuable in the arts and sciences from the available sources of all "times and of every nation, &c.," nor with his emphatic expressions of "the depth and solidity of the Germans," of "the worth of "German science," &c., nor even with his statement on page 15. "The German savans appeared sensible, that if both these propo- "sitions were established, &c., then all the learned lumber which "theorists had been accumulating for two thousand years must fall "to the ground." Foreigners, unacquainted with the character and standing of the German professors, might suppose these assertions, although contradicting each other, to proceed not only from prohibitory measures of the government, but also from party spirit and the fears entertained by the German practitioners, that this new doctrine might injure their practice. This mistake we feel

it our duty to rectify. No pamphlet or larger work in any language would long remain unnoticed or uncriticised in Germany, if it should contain a single important scientific idea or experiment. The German literary institutions publish upwards of sixty periodicals devoted to natural sciences only, more than one half of which are appropriated to medical essays and reviews. Most of these periodicals are issued in protestant states, where men possess, even on religious topics, an independence and liberty of discussion which, when we reflect upon the intimate connection between church and state still existing there, may justly be considered as unparalleled in any part of the civilized world. It must therefore be evident that such objects as are but distantly connected with the prerogatives and interests of monarchical governments, as for instance all the natural sciences and particularly medicine, are open to free discussion all over Germany. Most of the professors of medicine in the German universities are ardently attached to the sciences, and are also perfectly independent in their circumstances.* Hence they are generally quite indifferent about obtaining private medical practice, and those particularly who are engaged as physicians of hospitals and dispensaries, feel themselves in duty bound to subject every new method of treatment and every newly recommended drug to the test of experience in the presence of their students. In no other country therefore have new medical theories or modes of treatment spread so rapidly and so widely among the greater part of the profession, as in Germany; and in no other country have the oldest professors and practitioners so publicly avowed their long cherished errors and mistakes, and have received, upon the slightest appearance of truth, a new doctrine with greater candor or with more perfect disinterestedness. This was the case with John Brown's theory, which was zealously adopted by one of the greatest physicians of the age, John Peter Frank, when he was nearly seventy years old; and this was the case in our times also with the no less erroneous doctrine of Broussais.† But in every instance some appearance of reason, some consistency, is required.

* Their salaries are from one to upwards of ten thousand dollars per annum, besides their tickets for their lectures, and their shares as members of medical faculties, as examinators, &c., which, in some cases, increase their income to more than twenty thousand dollars per annum.

† It is not our object to lessen the respect due to this distinguished physician and author, though we deny the propriety of calling his doctrine pre-eminently "physiological medicine," and also, that he deserves the name, "father of modern medicine,"

Perhaps, the Germans generally appreciate the merits of their own countrymen less than those of foreigners, and are rather too much disposed to listen readily to scientific suggestions from abroad. This fault is owing to their natural want of petty literary egotism, which always exists in an inverse ratio with the extent of learning and acquirements; and to a want of national pride, arising from the political condition of that country. We may partly ascribe to this predilection for foreign suggestions the fact, that the practice of medicine has there also rather declined than improved for the last thirty years, although all the branches of theoretical medicine and surgery have attained a degree of perfection unsurpassed, if not unparalleled, in the literary history of all countries and ages. But, without the elevated self-respect of her literary men in scientific pursuits, the immense medical literature of Germany could not exist; many indispensable branches of the profession, for instance, medical jurisprudence, political, and especially psychical medicine, could not have originated in Germany, or attained there a perfection unheard of in other countries; nor would discoveries of their own medical men have been acknowledged for their intrinsic value, and pursued with perseverance, however little they have been noticed abroad. Thus animal magnetism, first mentioned about three centuries ago by Paracelsus, a German, and introduced as a remedy about sixty years since, by Mesmer, also a German, remained almost unnoticed by all other nations, the French excepted, although many professional men in Germany still apply this great agent as a remedy which, hereafter, will be

so emphatically bestowed upon him, particularly in the medical works of this country. Depending almost entirely on the evidence of post mortem examinations, and neglecting all higher philosophical conceptions, he directed his mind only to the palpable results of his investigations, and easily found by them what his favorite opinion had sought for. Like all those who pretend to be reformers in medicine, he cherished his hypothesis more than impartial scrutiny, by rejecting indiscriminately the truths contained in former medical doctrines. Partially opposed to abstract ideas, called by him "ontological abstractions," Broussais, however, introduced in his "irritation" an abstract conception, more vague and narrow than many similar ones before him, and which is also discordant with the gross materialism so much advocated by him in his writings, and particularly in his work "On Irritation and Insanity," in a manner which we must consider unworthy of an elevated mind.—A systematic doctrine of practical medicine, without regard to physiological principles, could be nothing but rude empiricism; and as every meritorious work on practical medicine must necessarily be founded on physiology, we cannot acknowledge that his system has any special claim to the term physiological system. We know of no important anatomical or physiological discovery for which the profession is particularly indebted to him, as it is to so many of his highly distinguished countrymen, who, like Bichat, Magendie, and many others, have in past and present times, so brilliantly enriched and improved the healing art.—"Palmam qui meruit, ferat."

more generally appreciated, when likewise divested of the mystery which fancy and credulity have so long combined with it.

Why, then, should Hahnemann's works have remained so long unnoticed in his own country, as Dr. Hering states? They were not; they have been frequently reviewed in the German periodicals. But the darkness of the middle ages had, at least in regard to the natural sciences and medicine, fortunately been dispersed in Germany too long for a favorable reception of Hahnemann's works. His disciples and adherents excepted, most medical authors and physicians, from the first promulgation of his doctrine down to the present time, have agreed that no apology could be offered for a man who boldly endeavours to destroy all that is rational in medicine, in order to substitute for it the rudest empiricism ever practised, and who had made, in his Organon and other works, a multitude of assertions and suggestions, totally at variance with common sense and with all the laws of nature, confirmed by the experience of centuries. We remember a review, published many years ago, in which the author asserted, that Hahnemann could have written his Organon only to revenge himself on the whole profession in return for their contempt of his Arcana.* The fact is, that we know of no work pretending to be scientific, and published within the last or present century, which is more crowded with contradictions, falsehoods and absurdities than Hahnemann's Organon, this treasure of the homœopathists, this "great result of twenty years investigation," which Dr. Hering compares (see page 9,) with the discoveries of a Galileo, a Harvey, a Columbus! This is obvious, not only to every well educated and judicious physician

* We candidly confess we believe it to be so, particularly since he published his last work on chronic diseases; though there are some pathognomonical symptoms of craziness observable in him, especially in those passages where he really speaks of his doctrine as a fanatic false prophet does of his new revelation. Thus, he says of his doctrines, on page 7, vol. iii., of his materia medica, "ignea inest illis vis et cœlestis origo," "they possess a fiery power, and come from heaven." In a scientific view no regard should be paid to his motives; and his expressions are interesting in a moral view only, as being or not being a part of his old public impositions. "Multum interest utrum peccare quis nolit aut nesciat."—Seneca.

Hahnemann was too good a scholar, too well educated in his profession, his doctrine originated at too mature an age, when such fancies as his are generally no longer the product of an exalted imagination, and last not least, his whole life was too much calculated for the promotion of his own interest, to reject entirely the conjecture of the reviewer mentioned. Should it be true, and should he, feeling his departure from this world of vain deception to be near, be conscious of his entering the world of bright unclouded truth, we would wish that he might secure to himself a better place in the history of medicine, by informing posterity of his true opinion, and of the steps which he took to prove to what extent the grossest errors and illusions can still be palmed upon so many. We sincerely wish that he may still live long, but a confession of this kind would be of much more value to the profession and to mankind, than if even the tenth part of all his suggestions were true.

who has practised any length of time, but to any one who knows how to read a book with attention, and can judge impartially. We hope that the time is near when that book, at least, will be accessible to the enlightened part of our professional brethren in this country; although it would be difficult for any faithful translator to preserve the vulgar style and tone which characterize this and all Hahnemann's works. Even those who think well of some of his tenets and suggestions, will admit the propriety of these remarks on reading some of our faithful quotations from Hahnemann's books; to quote all his nonsense, we should be obliged to translate almost all his works.

Many entertain the erroneous opinion, that the homœopathic and other doctrines of Hahnemann affect only practical medicine; and that they merely teach a new method of curing diseases, which, like other medical methods, may sometimes be right, and sometimes wrong. We shall endeavor to prove, that in adopting this doctrine in its whole extent, the very foundation of the human intellect would be shaken; and that all experience in the whole range of natural philosophy, scarcely excepting that which admits of a mathematical demonstration, would be much more unsafe now than it was in the darkest ages of superstition.

The debasement of the healing art, by Hahnemann and his followers, is obvious when we consider that they themselves state, that homœopathia is not only totally independent of, and incompatible with all other medical theories; but explicitly declare war against all reason and experience, saying, (see C. V. page 15,) that "all the learned lumber which theorists have been accumulating "for two thousand years must fall to the ground." Indeed, if these propositions be correct, and the medical profession, rejecting all theoretical expositions, should rely only upon naked facts, this noble science would soon be carried back far beyond the age of Hippocrates, when medicine was practised only by priests in temples, and when after a person was cured of a disease, besides the offering made to the deity, and the presents given to the priests, tablets were hung upon the walls of the temples, containing only the two requisites of homœopathia; the symptoms of the disease, and the simple remedy which proved successful, a time about which an able medical author, two centuries ago, (Meibom. in Diss. de incubat. § 2,) very correctly says, "tunc non sanabat medicina, sed "quidquid videbatur sanasse erat medicina," "at that time medi-

" cine did not cure, but whatever appeared to have cured was con-
" sidered to be a remedy."

Although our author, in accordance with Hahnemann in some passages of his works pretends, that great knowledge is requisite for the homœopathic practice, we appeal to any one whose judgment is sound and not prejudiced by party spirit or interest, whether he can conceive that any science whatever is indispensable or particularly useful to the homœopathic practitioner, since a minute knowledge of the symptoms of diseases, and of the properties of drugs are amply sufficient to constitute a homœopathic Doctor, and no faculty of the mind is required except a good memory aided only by perfect external senses. The faithful homœopathist may also possess all the great advantages of an accomplished education, if this is compatible with homœopathia, may be a great chemist, anatomist, botanist, &c., in short, may be a true polyhistor; but all his knowledge is quite useless in respect to his vocation. To an allopathist, a name applied by Hahnemann to all physicians who are not in favor of his doctrine—even the knowledge of a common trade* would be more useful for his practice, than a familiarity with anatomy,† physiology, chemistry, &c. is to an homœo-

* It is often highly important for the rational physician, relying more on the causes of the diseases than upon their delusive symptoms, to know to what particular injury an individual is exposed by his trade. The profession is much in need of a work similar to that of Ramazzini, "de Morbis Opificum," 1718, which shall detail those particulars, not only in respect to the new trades brought into existence during the last century, but also to the changes produced by machinery, &c. in the old trades.

† It would appear almost incredible that in the nineteenth century there should be Christian countries where the study of anatomy is restrained by laws, more worthy of the superstition of the middle ages than of our times, while we see even the Turkish Sultan and the Pacha of Egypt encourage its study, however much it is opposed to the tenets of the Koran. There are some eminent men who can overcome those restrictions by their diligent study and extraordinary talents; but the profession at large can never attain the requisite perfection without the most liberal provisions for this science, which must be considered as the key-stone of all medicine and surgery. The opposition of the public to post mortem examinations in private practice, particularly in rare cases, where examinations may be useful for the treatment of similar cases, tends to retard the advance of science, and is also unworthy of the present age. The corpse should justly be considered as a mere substance, doomed to decay, and as the property of the human society at large, and not as a person. "Curatio funeris, conditio sepulturæ, pompa exequiarum, magis sunt vivorum solatia, quam subsidia mortuorum," (Augustinus de Civ. c. 12.) It may here also be not improper to allude to the prevalent prejudice, that the healing art rests mostly on its practical branches, and that, if sufficient provisions are made for these, the profession and the public will be more benefited than by promoting its theoretical sciences. It is a prejudice by which the most talented young students of medicine lose the best opportunity of really attaining a high standing in their profession, and are forced to remain, for ever, common routiniers. A country which provides in the best manner for the study of anatomy, physiology, chemistry, and for the other branches of theoretical medicine, without the least provisions for observing the treatment of patients, would soon possess ten times as many distinguished physicians and respected medical authors, than another country which provides amply for the premotion of practical instruction in hospitals and almshouses,

pathist, although Hahnemann in his Organon (see p.p. 184 and 185, 4th edit.) urges particularly a due regard to the pursuit of the patient, more however with a view to promote the interest of the physician by making him intimately acquainted with family secrets, than with the intent of influencing a treatment, which, according to his doctrine of the origin and treatment of all chronic diseases, must always depend upon the removal of one and the same cause. But we wish seriously, that any homœopathist would explain to us of what use anatomy is to him, since, if he confines himself to medical practice, he can observe all the imaginable symptoms of the diseased state in the sense of his doctrine, without even the first rudiments of that science? Physiology, a science of which Hahnemann himself could never have had any sound conception, is so much crowded with hypotheses, conjectures, and "learned lumber," that it must appear to a homœopathist very fanciful and useless. Chemistry, in the eyes of the great genius, so "over-refined "in our age," and so defective, that the properties of the most common substances, the solubility of flint and sulphur in water for instance, or their transmutation into infinite spirits by their removal "from place to place in a fluid state," remained hitherto unknown to all the chemists of both hemispheres; mineralogy, botany, &c. are still more unnecessary to him, because others may collect the plants and simples, he himself being only obliged to dilute and rub them down, "secundum artis magicæ leges," and he must indeed do so if he attends but a few patients daily, as so many hours are required to learn all the symptoms and all the minutiæ of the patient's whole life, and as (see p. 25 C. V.) "the advantages of short visits and quickly writing a recipe," "cannot be "reconciled with homœopathia." Although the author of the concise view tells us (page 21) that his master recognises the anatomical and physiological sciences as by all means indispensable,

but pays but little regard to the theory. This may easily be proved by the low standing of the original medical literature of such countries, and by their necessary dependance on foreign literature. It may be asserted with the greatest propriety, that no science requires more the minutest study of its theoretical branches than medicine, since none admits of a greater variety of individual cases, the proper treatment of which depends mostly on general principles; for otherwise the old intelligent nurse would be the best physician, and the oldest herb-collector the greatest botanist. Practical acquirements are easily and quickly obtained in all scientific pursuits, where sound principles previously derived from a close study of their theory, are combined with natural talent, but not the reverse. Thus a man, thoroughly acquainted with geometry, trigonometry, and the other branches of pure mathematics, will learn in a few weeks, by himself or by a practical teacher, to be a good surveyor, whilst a merely practical man, without such acquirements, will never become eminent in his vocation, and will never be able to compete with the other in extraordinary cases.

and admits the *general* study of the prevailing systems of medicine, on account of the *historical knowledge* and *controversies* with other physicians, still we do not see the least advantage which either the homœopathist or his patients could derive from such "learned lumber." It is even probable that in regard to controversies with allopathists, if such "murderers" should continue to exist, contrary to the prophecies and hopes of the homœopathists, the latter will be as unfortunate as their great master, who, not succeeding in his controversies, at last concluded that he alone knew better in what the healing art consists, than all the professional men from Hippocrates down to his age, and that it never was, and never will be, necessary to be acquainted with any thing but the symptoms of natural diseases, and of those artificially produced in healthy persons by drugs, to perform the greatest, safest and most durable cures. (C. V. page 28.) It is evident how easily this knowledge can be acquired by any body who, perhaps unfitted for any other occupation, finds it convenient to make his living in this very commodious and pleasant manner. What an enviable situation such a worthy priest of Æsculapius has, in comparison with the industrious sturdy mechanic who, after serving an apprenticeship of four or five years, must expose his life and health all day to earn what the former can obtain in an hour without the least bodily or mental exertion! No wonder that this "new art of healing" now attracts those who, like many young people in our times, wish to reap without incurring the trouble and pains of ploughing and sowing, and that many are anxious to adopt this marvellous doctrine, even in countries where the degree of M. D. and the privilege of guarding the life and health of mankind, are conferred in less than a third of the time demanded by a cobbler for an apprentice of his trade. We could name instances where men without the least knowledge of medicine have been taught and declared qualified for practice, by a German homœopathist in this country, in less than three months; and it is well known to many professional men here, that an American homœopathist, who has also usurped this privilege, was prevented only by the conflicting interests of others from continuing to confer the degree of M. D. on those, whom he alone considered as worthy to practise according to the rules of this new "Art of Healing." The study of the history of medicine also recommended by Hahnemann, would rather appear to lead a man astray from the paths of homœopathia and injure

himself and his patients; because, it would impair his allegiance to the infallible doctrines of Hahnemann, who, in many passages of his works, explicitly forbids any reasoning on homœopathia, and demands of his disciples and followers more implicit faith, "without doubting, reasoning, interpreting or philosophizing "upon them" (see these expressions in Archiv fuer Homœopatische Heilkunde, Vol. IX. No. 3, and in Chron. Krankheiten, Vol. I. p. 213), than any orthodox or other religious creed requires of its confessors. Moreover all records in the history of medicine of the cure of diseases, in a manner different from his, are, according to Hahnemann, entirely false, and even one single speedy and permanent cure among hundreds of patients by the physicians of all ages, has been performed only by mere good fortune. (See Organon, p. p. 95 and 96.) The true history of the healing art begins with him—"qui se unus sapientem profiteri sit ausus (Cic. de fin.), and has, in his own time, and by the exertions of himself and his adherents, attained its highest degree of perfection; and all that appears to be left to posterity, is to observe a few more symptoms and to institute a few more trials with drugs!* It appears obvious that, if according to this new doctrine, the healing art can be so easily acquired by any body who can read, the public will find it quite superfluous to apply to the privileged class of physicians, as soon as the homœopathic text-books, the symptom-and-drug-sickness-dictionaries are accessible to them. All efforts of the homœopathists, who now appear to act in a body for the purpose of obtaining exclusively medical practice, and send missionaries to all quarters of the world to preach the new medical gospel in the unrivalled manner of the author of "A Concise View," will be unable to prevent this; particularly if we consider the confidence required of the patients, to submit to the minute and often indelicate cross-examination of a homœopathist (see Organon, p. p. 183 and 184), in order to ascertain where a small wart or a pimple

* As a little specimen of the extraordinary modesty and meekness of Hahnemann, "who had himself never assumed an offensive attitude," as Dr. Hering asserts, we quote here the following remarkable words of Hahnemann in the preface to his Organon: "It must be admitted that the true art of healing begins with me."

In order also to prove that our opinion of the requisites of a homœopathic physician is not erroneous, we quote here Hahnemann's own words on this subject; after explaining the mode of rocognizing a disease, he says in his Organon, p. 76: "This examination of an individual case, of which I have given only a general sketch, and of which the examiner retains only what is applicable to the case before him, demands nothing but freedom from prejudices, perfect senses, attention in observing, and fidelity in describing the disease."

may be located, &c., (see c. v. p. 22,) and which, however, is useless in most cases, since Hahnemann himself commands his followers not to rely upon the statements elicited by those severe examinations, if the result contradicts his latest axioma laid down in his marvellous work on chronic diseases—viz. that all such patients must be considered as itchy (see Organon, from p. 177 to 188, and in different places of the Treatise on Chr. Dis.) If we add to this, that many external diseases, generally considered as objects of surgical treatment, such as aneurism, necrosis, fistula ani and others (see Organon, p. 12), nay! even hernia inguinalis no longer require any surgical aid (see Chron. Dis. Vol. I. p. 188), the whole profession may soon be dispensed with.—It would really almost appear that Providence, having in her eternal wisdom and mercy inflicted mortality and painful diseases upon the human race, had now blessed mankind with a Hahnemann, who so readily teaches his infallible healing art to the most stupid as well as to the wisest of men! Henceforth, the well educated physicians, these murderers of their fellow-men, with all their "learned "lumber, accumulated during two thousand years," are unnecessary; the human intellect and imagination, and the talents of thousands, hitherto squandered for nothing but professional mischief and injury, may be exercised for other and more worthy purposes; in medicine they have been and will be of no value whatever! Who would be so stubborn, so heartless and abject, as not to hail such as a golden age, an age in which mankind has obtained blessings of more value than half of the long desired millenium, when,

> "The dumb shall sing, the lame his crutch forego,
> And leap exulting like the bounding roe."—*Pope.*

But alas! such prophecies, like those of the author of the Concise View, (see c.v. pages 28 and 29,) and his brethren, are utterly whimsical and false. Samuel Hahnemann, as we shall endeavor to prove hereafter, with all his fanciful productions and atoms of drugs, has not yet found one atom of the philosopher's stone. Some information and useful suggestions may be selected from the immense rubbish of his works, and may, if rightly appreciated, contribute to pave the way for a new and better era of practical medicine, which is so very much needed; but as homœopathia stands at present, we can only consider it compounded of the grossest errors

and falsehoods ever palmed upon the public, either by a morbid imagination and ignorance, or by intentional imposition.

From these general characteristics of Hahnemann and his works, it may easily be seen, why this new prophet and his doctrine remained so long unnoticed in his native country, and are still either disregarded or despised by her professors and physicians of repute. With the exception of Dr. Kopp, of Hanau, of whom we shall say a few words hereafter, *not one* distinguished professor, author or practitioner in Germany has, to our knowledge, hitherto declared in favor of homœopathia. With the exception of Hahnemann's disciples and adherents, who were not known in medical literature before they followed this doctrine, Dr. Hering, with his brother homœopathists *cannot name a single one.* The remarks on page 17, of his Concise View: "but day by day new adherents "were acquired, and mostly among the old practitioners, a phenomenon, in new systems, entirely unheard of," is, therefore, a gross error. His statements, however, on the same page, in regard to several individuals of distinguished rank and reputation, not physicians, are correct. In many countries, we find some who admire and follow Hahnemann's doctrines, until they have paid by the loss of their own health or life, or by that of their relatives and friends, for trusting in homœopathic treatment, or for believing, that the healing art is now rendered easily accessible to every one, merely by studying homœopathic text-books for a few months; since they think, that excepting a minute knowledge of homœopathic disease—symptoms, and their corresponding drug—symptoms, all professional acquirements are, altogether, mere trash. We know that in every age and country, and individuals in every class of society have been eager to play the physician, whenever they could, although they have formerly been aware of the long and careful study usually required by the profession; it is therefore not strange, that by the immense facilities offered by homœopathia to its votaries, many military men, merchants, tradesmen, and sometimes also a poet have raised their voices for this new doctrine, in Germany;* and, that it now may be said, with more propriety:

"Fingunt se medicos omnes, idiota, sacerdos,
"Judæus, monachus, histrio, rasor, anus."

* Most of our readers may find our description of the brilliant state of literature in Germany, quite in contradiction with our statement in regard to even the slight success of Hahnemann's works, and the more so, if we acknowledge that some well educated

Young physicians, attracted either by the novelty of this medical treatment, or too ignorant to succeed in the practice of rational medicine, have embraced homœopathia; some few, also, who are well educated, adopt it as a fashionable money-making business, and follow the practical, but dishonest maxim, "Mundus vult decipi, ergo decipiatur."

The admiration of homœopathia among the classes just named, attracted the attention of the two greatest German governments, Prussia and Austria, and afterwards also of Russia.

The Prussian government, a few years since, ordered a public trial of homœopathia to be made in the largest hospital of Berlin, the Charité, by one of Hahnemann's disciples, particularly recommended by him for that purpose. Although of the many hundred patients in that hospital, he selected twenty-five cases, which he considered most suitable for his experiments *not one* was cured. As Hahnemann afterwards asserted that the incompetency of his disciple must have been the only cause of failure, a second pupil was dispatched by him to Berlin; the same misfortune attending his practice also, he was dismissed.

The experiments instituted by the Austrian government in a large hospital at Vienna, were attended with the same results. Dr. Herrmann, of Saxony, one of the oldest disciples of Hahnemann, and probably the same, whose name is quoted so frequently

young physicians and other gentlemen in Germany, have zealously adopted and advocated this doctrine. But, among the many other peculiarities, which the native country of Kepler, Leibnitz, Kant, &c., presents to the observing foreigner, he will be surprised at seeing occasionally, productions totally unworthy of the elevated standing of her literature which still abounds, as it has for centuries, in master works in all arts and sciences; similar to the overrich soil, which in producing its gigantic sycamores, luxuriantly favors likewise the growth of many common weeds. Those foreigners who, ignorant of the German language, seldom become acquainted with distinguished German savans, and with the philosophical spirit which pervades the well educated classes of German society, and those who merely travel through that country, will with equal propriety consider it to be, in several respects, still many centuries behind the present age, whilst in others it has advanced many centuries before most other countries. Those, only, who have for a long time minutely examined the state of literature and arts in Germany, will be convinced that it may justly be considered in that respect as the modern Greece, though the general education of the people has not advanced in proportion to its advancement in other countries; notwithstanding the most praiseworthy exertions of the different governments, and particularly of Prussia, to improve it. The opinion of Americans of the medical profession in Germany, when formed from the German barbers and druggists, who on coming to this country borrow or assume the title of M. D., would be as erroneous, as would be that of the Germans, if overlooking the distinguished merits of Physick, Barton, Mott, Hosack, Francis, Warren, and others, they should judge of the American medical profession from the shoemakers and schoolmasters, who have turned homœopathists, or from the clerks and farmers, who after attending medical lectures for eight months have been awarded with a medical diploma.

n the experiments described in Hahnemann's materia medica, was expressly sent for by the Russian government, to try the new method in a military hospital; being completely unsuccessful, he was dismissed, and the homœopathic practice was entirely prohibited in all the Russian military hospitals. For the sake of experiment an equal number of patients, and so far as could be ascertained by minute examination, quite similar to those under the care of Dr. Herrmann, were at the same time publicly treated by Dr. Giggler, surgeon-general of the Russian army, methodo expectativa, or by mere diet, without administering any medicine, and the result was similar to that obtained by the homœopathic treatment of Dr. Herrmann, (see Hecker's Annalen der ges. Heilk. December, 1832.)

The author of the pamphlet before us says, also, on page 17, "It was carried to Naples, and in that kingdom obtained steadfast "adherents." Whilst reading this, we fully expected to find this statement incorrect; we thought that Italy, the cradle of all modern civilization and the native country of a Baglivi, a Morgagni, a Scarpa, &c., where the medical profession holds still as high a rank as in any other land, could not disgrace herself by the adoption of such a superstitious and rude empiricism as homœopathia presented to her. We were not mistaken; for the statement of Dr. Hering has been contradicted in toto, by a long and very interesting letter, directed to Dr. Hufeland, at Berlin, and lately published in the Heidelberger Annalen, (vol. viii., No. 3, for 1832.) The distinguished editors of that journal, Professors Chelius, Naegele, and Puchelt, of Heidelberg, and Professor Harless, of the University of Bonn, assert, that the writer of that anonymous letter, is not only an accomplished physician, but an author of the highest standing in the profession, and of strictly veracious and honorable character. It results from this letter, that in Naples, Rome, and other Italian cities, no physician can now express himself in favor of homœopa- unless it be at the risk of his reputation, in consequence of the number of failures, and even deaths, which have attended the practice of one of Hahnemann's disciples, and of some enthusiastic young Italian physicians. The homœopathist who introduced this practice at Naples, although an ignorant Bohemian barber, enjoyed the splendid patronage of the commanding Austrian general, to whom he was particularly recommended by Hahnemann. The public as well as some talented young physicians,

who embraced homœopathia with so much zeal, awoke from their illusive credulity, but not until the general, with many other personages of distinguished rank, had died, or were injured by this all-curing new healing art. We have not yet seen the reports in favor of homœopathia from "the sanguinary gold coast, and from Egypt, the land of monsters," as stated by Dr. Hering, on page 18; but we are willing to admit them as correct.—"Tot Galata, tot "Pontus eat, tot Lydia nummis!"—In countries where medicine is still in its infancy, and where medical practice is considered as a common trade, rather than as a scientific art, and where powerful prescriptions are administered with rash ignorance, homœopathia will best satisfy the credulity of the uneducated, and must be regarded as a blessing, on account of its decided negative usefulness. We would, therefore, consider it almost a crime to weaken the confidence of the people in the homœopathic treatment, in countries where the study of rational medicine is much neglected, and where the health and lives of the public are endangered by the absence of a protective medical police; but it is morally certain, that any thing is too dear, if purchased at the expense of truth or at the risk of destroying the foundation of all rational sciences; and nothing is more injurious to the physical as well as the moral happiness of men than superstition. Hence Bacon says, and correctly, that even atheism is far less injurious than superstition: "Atheis-"mus non prorsus convellit dictamina sensus, non philosophiam, "affectus naturales, leges, bonæ famæ desiderium; quæ omnia, "licet religio absesset, morali cuidam virtuti externæ conducere "possunt: ac superstitio hæc omnia dejicit, et tyrannidem absolutam "in animis execret." (See his Treatise de Superstitione.)

With regard to "the real triumph" of this new method of treating "the most violent and malignant forms of the Asiatic cholera," of which Dr. Hering says, on page 27: "however varied were its "forms in the different countries, and in different individuals, and "as multiform and strange and malignant as it was, they cured as "well in Russia as in Hungary, in Vienna and Prague as well as in "Berlin, in Philadelphia as well as in Germany, with equal success. "The most recent statements received from all quarters have bril-"liantly established this;" our accounts, however, vary much from those of our veracious author, and, moreover, unfortunately for him and his cause, they are even contradicted, by some of his homœopathic brethren, like many other accounts quoted by him. In the

very periodical which he values so highly on page 18, and which may be considered as the trumpet of the homœopathic propaganda, viz. in the *Archiv fuer Homœopathische Heilkunde*, Vol. XII. No. 1, &c., many of Hahnemann's disciples, and particularly Dr. Schroeter, at Lemberg, in Poland, and several homœopathic practitioners, at Berlin, have declared, that the treatment of Asiatic cholera, with camphor, as well as Hahnemann's other suggestions, had proved utterly abortive in practice. Dr. Thummel, one of the ward physicians of Berlin, during the prevalence of Asiatic cholera in that city, has reported, that of the many cholera patients who were treated by homœopathists in his ward, only one recovered, (see Berlin Med. Zeitung, 1832.)—It is really not a little surprising, that our author, with his brother homœopathists of this country, so confident of the *infallibility* of their treatment, and of the *positive* and curative power of camphor in Asiatic cholera, did not follow the praiseworthy example of the noble and highminded French physicians, Drs. Bailly, Pariset and others, who, for the sake of philanthropy and professional investigation, went to places affected with the yellow fever and the oriental plague, to ascertain the character and treatment of these fatal diseases, without any specific or protective " real triumph" in their pockets. The American homœopathists however, remained quietly in their eastern residences, without hastening, from motives of philanthropy and professional duty, or from really praiseworthy zeal for the propagation of their infallible doctrine, to the unfortunate countries of the west, where thousands fell victims to this scourge; although certainly none of the benevolent citizens of the other states, would have denied them a liberal support if called upon, in order to save the lives of their fellow citizens. This would have been the proper occasion for them to prove their disinterested humanity, and their implicit confidence in the pledge of their great medical genius, Samuel Hahnemann, who, in his first treatise on Asiatic cholera, prophesied, in the year 1831, " I hope " that no body will henceforth die, to whom this treatment (with " camphor) shall be applied early."—We are sorry to mention, that, on the contrary, we know of instances, where homœopathic physicians, attacked by cholerophobia, left their places of residence upon the approach of this dreadful epidemic, and did not return, until they could earn their dollars again, without exposing their valuable lives and health; which certainly proves anything

but confidence in the infallible protection and cure, promised by their " illustrious" master, provided they have to stake any thing more than the paltry pains of a refined charlatanism.—

" The better part of valour is, discretion."—*Shaks.*

As an impartial critic we must however state that, according to the latest accounts contained in German newspapers, some of the governments there, have again noticed homœopathia, by ordering new trials of its treatment to be instituted. From this we may infer, that there is no necessity for the particular protection claimed by Dr. Hering from the American people in behalf of homœopathia, as for a distinguished demagogue who, forced to leave his native country in distress, takes refuge in this free and happy land. We, at least, have not heard any thing like the extremely ridiculous story (on page 29, c. v.) that the "kings and princes " of Europe, &c. impede the progress of the new art by processes, " penalties and bayonets, their other and more important cares " notwithstanding." On the contrary, as far as we know, " the " old philosopher" reposes quietly upon his laurels in his high pontifical see at Coethen, undisturbed by any military force.

We have already alluded to the causes which made many laymen of rank in Germany partial for homœopathia. The last accounts from thence (contained in the Allgemeine Zeitung) state, that the chamber of deputies of Baden have resolved, almost unanimously, to have a special chair of homœopathia in the Heidelberg university; the same we are told was resolved by the Bavarian government for the university of Munich. We may justly suppose, that these respectable authorities have never minutely considered the bearings of homœopathia, otherwise it would be exceedingly foolish to consider the whole of any doctrine useful, while its single parts consist of the most palpable nonsense. " An " quidquam stultitius, quam quod singulos contemnas, eos aliquid " putare esse universos?" (Cic. Tusc.) Nevertheless these revolutions prove clearly, that this doctrine is there considered quite different from all rational medicine, since, if it were only a new mode of the latter for curing diseases, it would be no more required to establish a particular professorship for this, than it has been hitherto necessary to appoint a professor exclusively for the systems of Brown, Broussais, &c. or for any other new and different medical theory; these having always been left to the judicious consideration of the professors of practical medicine, or of medical his-

tory and literature. We are told also by men upon whose veracity we can rely, that new trials of homœopathia are contemplated in some other capitals of Germany, in consequence of the wishes expressed by many distinguished individuals in the armies and in official stations, who have said they were cured by homœopathists, after they had been long and unsuccessfully treated by other physicians; perhaps also, because Dr. Kopp, known as a learned and experienced practitioner and author on legal and practical medicine, has seemingly joined the homœopathic ranks. The best medical periodicals, however, which have reached us, scarcely allude to the existence of homœopathia; whenever they mention it, it is only to ridicule its frequent failures and the singular steps taken by its adherents.

Whoever deliberates on the great advantages which European governments might easily derive, directly or indirectly, from this new doctrine, will give them great credit for not embracing homœopathia more anxiously, and not enforcing it long since, simply on account of their humanity and predilection for the promotion of truly scientific education. Willing to gratify the public voice, whenever expressing itself in favor of objects, unconnected with politics, homœopathia would have offered to them the best means to check the progress of the human intellect, also in regard to their political objects in view. For what could be better calculated to counteract and to eradicate all reasonable or extravagant excitements for unrestricted religious and political liberty, than credulity and superstition, particularly in regard to objects of such general and great importance as health and life? People who believe, that the noble exertions of the most talented and learned men of all ages to unveil and discover the laws of nature, and to promote truth, have led only to errors and mistakes in the first principles of all sciences, and who are persuaded that, besides the great wonders of nature which the human intellect endeavours to divest of its miraculous features, there exist miracles at the disposal of men, will be unquestionably more disposed to admit also the divine rights bestowed by birth or by a sacred unction. Nations, infatuated by an implicit belief in the miracles of magic and witchcraft, will unquestionably submit more quietly to their fate, however oppressive it may really or apparently be, than strive to attain that, which the history of all ages proves to them either more or less abortive, or at least to be attainable only by those terrific dangers

which have always attended religious and political revolutions. The great advantages which the treasury and other important branches of the government would derive from homœpathia, if it should be found as certain and beneficial as Hahnemann and his adherents assert, would prove still more, that the European governments ought to have forced it long since upon their people, even in opposition to the selfish obstinacy and low interest of the dissenting allopathic physicians and apothecaries, who, after all, constitute but a small part of the whole population. Hundreds of millions of dollars would be saved, which have hitherto been squandered by the learned fancy or the ignorant prejudices of the pernicious class of allopathic physicians, for immense quantities of costly drugs; the great number of professors, appointed at heavy expenses, for so much "learned lumber" would no longer be of any use, as every one could attend to his own health by the aid of his homœopathic guide and a few shillings' worth of drugs.

In time of war, also, homœopathia would offer immense advantages, not only by the facility with which large armies might be victualled by the developed virtues of liquid and solid nourishment; but also by preserving the lives of the soldiers not slain in battle, who would otherwise be sacrificed by the murderous treatment of allopathic physicians, (see C. V. p. 28.) The whole class of military physicians might be dismissed, and a few ignorant homœopathic surgeons only would be required, especially if they were assisted by a symptom-secretary, and a duly initiated drug-triturator; they might then also officiate as apothecaries, and thus become medico-chirurgical fac-totums for a large army, of which the whole drug store and laboratory might be contained in a small chest, measuring only a cubic foot, and be easily carried, together with the whole surgical apparatus, by a donkey.—"Misce stultitiam consiliis brevem." (Hor.)—With such valuable advantages to the European governments, to the public at large, to the wealthy and the poor; it is indeed astonishing that kings and princes have been hitherto so short sighted, as not to promote the progress of homœopathia! The humane and patriotic apprehensions for our common native country, expressed by Dr. Hering, on page 29, will, however, be appeased, at least for a short time; for even the opposition of the intelligent will there also promote its extension, as this has always been found to be the most efficient mode of making uneducated people still more partial for objects of credulity

and superstition, until sad experience has enlightened their dim-sighted eyes. The celebrated author on demonology and witchcraft says very correctly, "It has always been remarked that those "morbid affections of mind which depend on imagination, are sure "to become more common, in proportion as public attention is "fastened on stories connected with their display." We may rationally expect, that in Germany particularly, many more weak-minded physicians will be seriously attacked by this mental influenza, though not for a long time, as the benefits of profound erudition, and especially of philosophical studies, will soon radically cure this spiritual epidemic. "If Germany furnishes the bane, it gives us "the antidote too," (c. v. page 6.) We merely hope and wish in this case, not in a homœopathic dose!

Our able author of the "Concise View," complains also on page 16, of "the united intrigues of the apothecaries at Leipzig;" (the literary emporium of the whole world, which for upwards of four centuries has possessed a university, distinguished by its professors in all sciences, and particularly in medicine,) and of "the "laws which prohibit the dispensing of medicines by physicians, "under a heavy penalty, and permit it only to the privileged "apothecaries;" and further, that these laws "were brought to "bear against him.—Hahnemann, who always gave the simple "medicine, in his entirely novel preparations, in which an extra-"ordinary care and accuracy were indispensable, could not pos-"sibly commit this labor, upon which the certainty of the result "and the welfare of his patient depended, to the apothecaries; who "not at all familiar in such unheard of niceties, regarded the whole "business as absurd, and whose pecuniary interests had to suffer "thereby, quite as much as the pecuniary interests of the patients "were benefitted."—We cannot conceive why Dr. Hering, provided he has not yet forgotten the necessity of apothecaries for allopathic practice, and provided he admits in justice, that unless "the great truth" has been generally adopted, the regulations suggested by him on page 4, "to render their entire profession superfluous," could not be anticipated,—we say, we cannot conceive why he, himself a German, objects to the old regulations above quoted. Among the many wise laws of the German governments, which partly compensate for the restrictions of religious and political liberty, we must consider those as most beneficial, which are passed for the liberal promotion of the sciences and arts, and more particularly

for the protection of the lives and health of their people by a strict medical police. It is difficult to explain, why republican governments of the present age, are so anxious to protect by law all other property of their citizens, while they leave almost unprotected the most valuable and irreparable kind of property, life and health. This cannot, of course, be an inevitable consequence of reasonably unrestricted liberty itself, as the most trifling violation of laws and privileges, are often more severely punished there, than in monarchical governments. We see, for instance, that in such a republican country, a farmer runs the risk of having his entire market stock of butter confiscated, if half an ounce or less is wanting to the pound, perhaps by carelessness only; although every citizen would prefer to be wronged in this and in similar trifles, which moreover he may easily prevent, rather than risk the lives of his family by the ignorance and carelessness of an uneducated physician or druggist. In some European countries, and especially in Germany, the laws on these points are very strict, and are beneficial in protecting the health of the public: it is therefore particularly strange, that our author, as a German of professional education, should find fault with such salutary regulations. We are sorry to observe in this a new proof, that even men of talent, and perhaps unobjectionable moral principles, when influenced by fixed ideas and party spirit, loose sight of every thing, even of that which must injure their own reputation, bringing upon themselves the odium of their indiscreet and unjust degradation of a highly respectable class of their countrymen. A publica accusation from any other person, that the labor of composing simple medicines could not possibly be committed to German apothecaries, because they are *not at all familiar with such unheard of niceties, and because it would interfere with their pecuniary interests*, should appear ridiculous and puerile even to a German homœopathist, as he must know, that before an apothecary in Germany is examined as an assistant, or has a licence granted to him, he must exhibit proofs of a classical education, and of a course of study for at least five years; that he further has to bind himself by an oath, and under heavy penalties, to prepare with the utmost exactitude and nicety the prescriptions of every regular physician, unless it appears to him evident, that the dose prescribed is dangerously large, and might be a written error of the physician, of whom he is then bound to inquire about it; a case which could never happen to homœopathists who pre-

scribe such infinitely small doses.* This outrageous abuse of an entire class of respectable men by Dr. Hering, is paralleled only by

* In some of the German States, for instance, in Hessen-Cassel, the government is so excessively anxious to trust the apothecary business to such men only, as are constantly in the practice of it, that even those who have fulfilled all the requisites of the law, but have remained idle, or have embarked in another occupation for two years only, must, in order to obtain a second licence for the practice of pharmacy, subject themselves again to a new and rigorous examination, in which some chemical preparations are required to be made. The importance of the subject demands a few farther remarks. If we except a few common medicines, no physician can rely upon the genuineness of drugs in this country, at least to our knowledge and experience; though there are some very distinguished chemists and pharmacopolists among the immense number of, so called, apothecaries. The principal reason is, that in most of the States any body, however ignorant, can open a drug-store, and compete with the best educated and faithful apothecary; the latter, instead of making his living honestly, would thus be obliged, by competition, to sacrifice many hundred dollars yearly by keeping a good store of genuine drugs and other preparations, many of which are decomposed or spoiled in a short time; and as he is not indemnified by a regular set of customers, he is obliged to regard cheapness much more than genuineness; and even as the only means of subsistence. This is, also, the reason why many wholesale druggists, in large American commercial cities, to our knowledge, deal only in the cheapest kind of drugs for inland consumption, and refuse to purchase at a high price, genuine drugs, except they can export them, at good profit, to Europe; convinced by repeated experience, that their high prices would prevent their sale here. This fact explains why, in a country where labor is so dear, a compound medicine is generally cheaper than one of its ingredients would be if it were good, for instance, lunar caustic is much cheaper than the weight of silver which it should contain when pure; and, also, why a pulverized drug is often sold for less than one half the price of the crude but unadulterated article, as we have often experienced. Can it well be expected from a common uneducated retail druggist, who has to pay high for his rent, and for so many requisites to make his establishment fashionable and elegant, and who of course intends to make as much money as possible, that he will keep genuine drugs, or such as are seldom asked for, and that he will pay the highest prices for drugs, which he frequently can purchase for less than one-third what the best kind would cost him; as he is not subject to any law or control, which would oblige him to keep only the best articles on hand? The public cannot judge of drugs as they can of bread and other articles of food and drink when in good health; the law, therefore, should protect them as much as possible. The injury to the public must be evidently incalculable, when we consider that the degrees of adulteration are very numerous, while the statements or directions of the medical profession are always based on the genuine article. It is revolting for every honest and conscientious physician, to see publicly offered for sale, at different prices, the most important drugs, when every patient confidently hopes, to have at least the best drug administered to him. If we consider how often a few drops of stale or adulterated wine injure a patient, we may easily comprehend that drugs, which, when properly prepared, are beneficial, become highly detrimental by the least alteration or adulteration. The preparation of many medicines, particularly of narcotic extracts, depends so much on minutiæ and on their freshness, that one grain may be beneficial, and a drachm of no effect at all; hence it must be considered a defect even in European countries, that all those preparations which vary so much by the time of collecting the plant, preparing the medicine, &c., particularly the extracts of narcotic indigenous plants, are not entrusted to one central institution, from which all druggists of a large city or county are bound to draw their supply. By this, also, much more uniformity in regard to the effect of pharmaceutical preparations would exist, instead of which one physician now considers a medicine highly valuable, while another regards it as useless. The want of good medicines in one country, compared with another, is frequently the only cause why highly valuable experiences of the profession in the one, are frequently lost or ridiculed in another. If, for instance, a well educated American physician, not in favor of homœopathic conceptions, should read in a German treatise of six drops of laudanum in a mixture of six ounces, he would smile at such a dose of laudanum, because he is accustomed to prescribe sixty and more in the same quantity of mixture. The German would, in return, consider an experiment with such a

the greatest absurdity perhaps ever printed in this country. On page 13, of his "Concise View," we read, "He (Hahnemann,) "discovered a mode, by which one drop could be accurately divided "into any desirable number of parts." Any one will admit, that it would be difficult to find in the United States a school-boy, who if possessed of a sound mind, and familiar only with the first rules of arithmetic, would be for a moment at a loss, to find out instantaneously the *great discovery*, proclaimed with so much emphasis as if worthy of a Leibnitz, a Newton, or Legendre, viz: how one drop of any solution of a drug or another soluble substance is to be divided by water or alcohol into $\frac{1}{100}$, $\frac{1}{10000}$ or any similar fraction! And yet, with all these frothy pretensions, this great problem is even not solved correctly. The same boy could unquestionably prove to such great dealers in "trifles and unheard of niceties," that with all their mystifications, they are ignorant even of the first rules of arithmetic, for if one grain of an extract be dissolved in a hundred drops of alcohol; and one drop of this solution be diluted by another hundred drops, we have one hundred and one drops, and one drop of the last dilution will contain, with all their shakings, not as stated in the Concise View, page 12, the $\frac{1}{10000}$ but the $\frac{1}{10100}$ part of a grain of the extract, and thus

quantity of laudanum extremely dangerous, and if he would prescribe twenty drops only, he would find the American statement about the cure of a disease false, though it was true and repeatedly confirmed by minute observations. The only reason is that the German apothecary is in duty bound to prepare the laudanum exactly according to the prescription of Sydenham, its first inventor, whereas in this country the apothecary being under no legal obligations, but at liberty to keep, to prepare and to sell what and how he pleases, this indispensable medicine is generally nothing but a poor solution of the worst kind of opium in common brandy, which, in many instances, especially in diseases of children, injures almost as much by the quantity of brandy as of opium. No wonder, therefore, that many American druggists can sell an ounce of such miserable stuff, the vial included, for a sixpence, though, if made exactly according to the prescription from the best ingredients, one ounce would cost the druggist himself at least upwards of two shillings. It is difficult to procure, even in large commercial cities like New York and Philadelphia, small quantities of drugs, considered by the profession in Europe as very valuable, and even as indispensable; and most of the American physicians, and even the professors, must therefore remain ignorant about their use. Musk and castoreum moscoviticum for instance, for which the poor Germans pay higher than for gold, because experience has taught them for more than centuries, that in many diseases, especially of children and women, as for instance in asthma spasmodicum Millari, typhus fever, nervous affections, &c., their place cannot be substituted by any other drug. Many distinguished physicians of this country, consider however both as obsolete and valueless; and even Professor Cox of Philadelphia, who has taught materia medica for so many years, continues to assert in the 8th edition of his Materia Medica, published 1832, that musk is an obsolete drug, not worth more than other kinds of dried animal excrements, likewise recommended by old authors as medicines. No wonder! for he, together with Professor Bigelow, who in his Materia Medica, considers also musk and castoreum as superfluous, have probably never used them when genuine, and have never seen them applied by others, though many distinguished English authors, such as Cullen, Robert Whyte, &c., have recommended them highly.

continued, the 6th dilution for instance, does not contain $\frac{1}{1000000000000}$ but $\frac{1}{1061520151601 00}$ part of a grain; making a difference of the $\frac{1}{1051521050000000}$ part of a grain—a monstrous, nay perhaps homicidal error to the unfortunate patient of a full-blooded homœopathist!—now this error increases so immensely in the 10th, 20th, or even 60th dilution, that the lives of an immense number of patients may be endangered! This shocking error, committed by Hahnemann in the first edition of his Organon, published in 1810, will still be observed in its last edition of 1829, and in his other works. The fact, that none of his disciples or adherents have as yet observed or altered these prescriptions, may be considered as a very striking proof of the implicit faith of men in the tenets of their master, be they ever so absurd.

Although we do not claim any minute knowledge of deep mathematical calculations, we feel it our professional duty to teach homœopathists, how to avoid in future such palpable and important mistakes, by the following formula, the substance of which is, that they should always add only ninety-nine drops, instead of a hundred, after the first solution is made, and the same should be observed from the beginning, if one grain of a drug is to be rubbed down with sugar of milk. Taking x equal to one grain of the extract, and n equal to the intended degree of dilution, the whole progression of the different dilutions, rising in their developed virtue, would then present the following formula: first solution, or x is equal to $\frac{1}{10^2}$, second dilution or $x^2 = \frac{1}{10^4}$, third dilution or $x^3 = \frac{1}{10^6}$, ... n^{th} dilution or x^n = to $\frac{1}{10^{2n}}$; or each desired dilution contains a fraction of the original grain of the extract, equal to one divided by the power of ten, double the index of the degree of the solution. By following their above stated wrong calculation, of always adding a hundred drops to their first dilution, x^n contains a quantity equal to $\frac{1}{10^2\,(10^2+1)^{n-1}}$ part of a grain; the general formula of this progression would present the first solution or x^1, equal to $\frac{1}{10^2}$, second solution or $x^2 = \frac{1}{10^2\,(10^2+1)}$ third solution or $x^3 = \frac{1}{10^2(10^2+1)^2}$ . . . . . n^{th} dilution or $x^n = \frac{1}{10^2(10^2+1)^{n-1}}$. The formula for triturat-

ing can be easily deduced in the same manner.* Still greater errors will be found in Hahnemann's works, utterly inconsistent with his whimsical dilutions and triturations, as we shall state hereafter, although he calls (Vol. I. Chron. Dis. p. 2), homœopathia, "the great gift of God," and according to Dr. Hering, (on page 21, C.V.) "he urges upon his pupils the propriety of addicting themselves "to close thinking by the study of mathematics." But we cannot reconcile the necessity of thinking at all, and much less of "close thinking," with the homœopathic doctrine and practice, both of which, as we have seen, depend, according to the suggestion of Hahnemann himself, only upon good senses and a good memory, in addition to implicit faith in his dictates. We must, however, approve of this wise advice, provided the "great genius" is not so ignorant in modern mathematics, as he is in modern chemistry. It appears almost, that he confounds this mother of all exact sciences, in its present state, with the "ars mathematica" of the dark middle ages, which contained the most horrible superstitions in magic, demonology and witchcraft, all of which he seems to favor.

As to our author's complaints in regard to the obstacles Hahnemann met with, we must state to the contrary, that the king of Saxony, as well as the city authorities at Leipzig, did in no way interfere in his practice or that of his disciples, except requiring of them to observe the laws passed long before, which prohibited the dispensing of medicines by physicians. These were the more to be enforced with regard to a man, who had exposed himself to public contempt by his alcali pneum, and by his pretended secret preventive against scarlet fever, and who continued to involve his practice in mystery, recalling the days of rude superstition, when only the hands, consecrated by the high priest, were considered adequate to dilute or rub down a grain of a drug. Besides, it was but just and proper for the authorities at Leipzig, to protect the respectable class of apothecaries, who cannot establish in Germany, as they can in many other countries, a retail drug store without the knowledge required for so important an occupation, and without an ample pledge for their capacity to the public. It is only after a strict theoretical and practical examination in chemistry, pharmacy, botany, mineralogy, &c. that they are permitted to buy

* We have preferred the more usual power of ten, to that of one hundred, which would have made the formula still more simple.

a privileged establishment, and the number of apothecaries is judiciously limited in proportion to the population.* The apothecary being bound to keep a large stock of the best drugs constantly on hand, many of which are spoiled within a few weeks or months and are therefore to be renewed at great expense, and obliged to have a laboratory, chemical apparatus, &c, could not be indemnified, even by a profit of a thousand per cent, nor could he make his living honestly, without a considerable number of customers, on whom he could confidently rely.

Nothing but his old predilection for arcana and nostrums, could have prevented Hahnemann from writing his prescriptions ,as all physicians are bound by law to do in Germany, and none but one of his infatuated disciples could assert, that in a city like Leipzig, there was no apothecary capable of being made " fami- " liar in such unheard-of niceties," which any boy of twelve years of age could perform satisfactorily. The laws against the dispensing of medicines should be enforced with no physicians more than with homœopathists, not to prevent their most innocent practice, but to guard against all unnecessary mystery in a subject, which is yet in all its features so opposed to the human intellect and to all experience. It is evident that no physician, when he himself furnishes medicines to his patients, can be held amenable to the laws for any mal-practice, and that it is as satisfactory to every honest physician, as it is to the public, to have deposited by his prescriptions valuable documents of his circumspect, careful and conscientious treatment, in the hand of a third party, the apothecary, who is bound to preserve and to copy them. For if the patient grows worse or dies, the relatives are at liberty to have the prescriptions examined by impartial and competent judges, and the physician likewise may rely on them at any time, for his defence. How highly important are such regulations in a legal point of view; in a criminal case, for instance, where the physician is suspected of having murdered his patient on account of his large

* In Berlin, for instance, the wealthy capital of Prussia, with a population of about two hundred and fifty thousand, there are only twenty-eight apothecaries. On this account retail drug-stores in large German cities, including the licence, which, for public convenience, belongs to the building, cost from thirty thousand to upwards of eighty thousand dollars. Once every year they are unexpectedly visited by a committee of magistrates and professional men, appointed by the government to examine the genuineness and quality of the stock on hand, the laboratory, &c. Every error or defect of importance, subjects the owner to serious reproaches, and by repeated instances, by meddling with medical practice, or by the illegal sale of poisons, &c. he risks the loss of his privilege.

fortune or from other motives.* The ignorant and careless physician will be always aware of these checks, and the miser has no opportunity to administer to his patients cheap drugs for which he charges extravagantly, where expensive ones might have been required. The advantages which the medical sciences as well as the public derive from the wise regulations mentioned, would be totally lost; and no honest retail druggist could subsist in Germany, or in any other country, where a strict medical police is considered indispensable, if physicians should be permitted to dispense their medicines themselves under any nugatory pretext. By the strict maintenance of these laws, all danger and mysterious quackery are removed, the health and life of the people are protected by the occupations of the physician and apothecary being independent of each other, and proper care can be taken by a vigilant medical police, that both do their duty and that justice is done to them. Let us for a moment even admit, that a homœopathic physician, either regularly educated before adopting this "new art," or having acquired it in a few weeks, (as was the case with an American shoemaker who, tired of his trade, became, by the aid of a benevolent homœopathist a doctor,) can cure most of his patients; still every honest homœopathist, Hahnemann and Dr. Hering excepted, will admit that cases, be they ever so rare, may exist, which will not yield to homœopathic but to allopathic treatment. In such a case, even the well educated homœopathist, who is forced to leave his usual practice, by adopting a method which he might have forgotten, or at least have been unaccustomed to employ, may resort to measures which can easily do great injury; but if he is obliged to prescribe his recipe regularly, he will be more careful, and also be prevented from injuring the patient, by the control of the apothecary. The history of the Asiatic cholera proves that our apprehensions are not imaginary, but that in fact, where homœopathists, who had been well educated in the principles of rational medicine, and had adopted homœopathia for a certain length of time, were afterwards obliged to recur to the allopathic treatment; they prescribed medicines in much larger doses than were ever approved of by any former school. Thus, if the homœopathic doses of camphor, recommended by Hahnemann as an infallible cure for this disease, proved unsuccessful, they nearly deluged

* An instance of this kind happened a few years ago at Paris, and the suspected physician was convicted and executed.

their patients with it. (See Allgem. Anzeiger &c., der Deutschen, 1831, No. 173, p. 2356 and Kopp l. c.) What mischief may then be expected from a man like our homœopathic shoemaker, in such cases, who is entirely ignorant of all the "learned lumber" which is indispensable to the allopathic practice, if uncontrolled by a well educated apothecary, who might prevent him from increasing, to a great extent, the doses of the powerful homœopathic drugs, such as belladonna, nux vomica, arsenic, &c., as his brethren did those of camphor, in the treatment of cholera?

The self-dispensing of medicines appears to be an innate propensity, the very *foible* of all homœopathists, from their master down to the homœopathical doctors, barbers, shoemakers, &c. No wonder! if we consider, that it is extremely profitable to buy, on commencing practice, about twenty dollars worth of drugs, which may produce every year several hundred dollars profit, and by adding annually a few dollars worth, may become a profitable stock, sufficient even for the great-grandson of the disinterested and benevolent doctor; undoubtedly far better than any stock of a bank, a rail-road, &c., ever will be. We may well exclaim with the author of the Concise View, on page 29, "a treasure like "this new art must quickly be estimated in a degree commensu- "rate with its real value."* This is probably one of the principal reasons why most homœopathists are so extremely anxious to mystify the great art of homœopathic triturations, dilutions and shakings of their drug-atoms, which *they only* can perform well; and though they willingly may renounce the old meaning of the initials M. D. on account of the "learned lumber" still indispensably connected with that signature in many countries, they are anxious to preserve it probably in the sense of the signature of the old Roman emperors, "Manu Divina."

To prove further, that the quotations from Dr. Hering's "Con- "cise View," are not to be considered as a lapsus linguæ, it being

* Excepting the little trouble of shaking or rubbing down the drugs, the smallest coin in existence would pay many thousand per cent profit for any homœpathic medicine, since *one* grain of any drug would be more than amply sufficient for the practice of a homœopathist, even if he lived ten times as long as Methusaleh, and attended daily thousands of patients. Generally, however, they make their patients pay very high for medicines as well as for their services; and we know of instances where homœopathists, being obliged to prescribe a recipe in urgent cases, or where the patient insisted upon their so doing, anxiously endeavoured to prevent the apothecary from charging only a few cents for the medicine, as he might feel bound to do, but requested him to charge half a dollar, apparently intending to avoid the suspicion of their patients that the medicine was of no value, but in reality to make their usual impositions of that kind less conspicuous.

originally delivered as a speech, but that he believes these absurdities and would make them also credible by others, we refer in addition to pages 12 and 13, where, in speaking of the high dilutions, he says, " however striking this phenomenon was in itself, " and however wonderful and strange it must have appeared to " Hahnemann, it nevertheless has been indisputably the result of " his manipulations." Now, we ask any one of common sense, whether this is not witchcraft, white magic, a kind of chiromancy, &c. revived in optima forma? It is impossible to see such things printed in 1833, without dreading that the grossest superstition may again for a time eclipse the beams of reason. It is therefore extremely creditable to the Austrian and Russian governments, that they have not only published the abortive results of the experiments with the homœopathic treatment in the hospitals, but have, as far as we know, forbidden its further application.

On examining more closely the homœopathic doctrine, as contained in Dr. Hering's " Concise View," which forms a faithful, though very defective, abstract of Hahnemann's works, we know not whether to be more amazed at his boldness in rejecting the experience of the profession accumulated for upwards of two thousand years, and constantly confirmed by the minute observations of so many distinguished physicians, or to express the just indignation, which every one must feel, who reflects on the nonsense, the inconsistency and falsehood of the doctrine itself. The indispensable reference to Hahnemann's works renders this task much more difficult and tedious, as it is not sufficient to read only one edition of one and the same work, but to compare its different editions, to prove the gross retractions and contradictions published at different times; the tenets and prescriptions once maintained by him as eternal truths, being afterwards even rejected as false by himself.

Dr. Stieglitz, private physician to his H. B. M. and president of the medical college of Hanover, one of the most renowned medical authors and practitioners of Germany, says very properly in his last valuable work, (Pathologische Untersuchungen, 1832, Vol. II. page 359), " No truly distinguished thinker or eminent physician " has as yet joined with Hahnemann, or declared himself fa- " vorable to the mass of nonsense contained in homœopathia; a " doctrine which deserves no refutation, because it admits of " none; boasting of rejecting all scientific discussion, and deriving " its only support from propositions, opposed to the foundation of

" all intellect and knowledge." The only exception to this statement, which also contradicts the report of our author and his brethren in this country, respecting the rapid spread of this doctrine in Germany, is Dr. Kopp, at Hanau, well known in Germany as an eminent practitioner and an honest man, to whose publications the profession is very much indebted. He states, in the introduction to his latest work, (Erfahrungen und Bemerkungen bey einer pruefenden Anwendung der Homœopathie am Krankenbette. Frankfurt, 1832.), that after studying diligently all works belonging to the homœopathic doctrine for two years, he had subjected it to an impartial trial for about three years. Dr. Kopp has taken the very ground, which Hahnemann and his followers have constantly urged physicians to take, viz. experiments faithfully instituted; he confirms the correctness of the homœopathic treatment by a comparatively considerable number of cases, though by no means to the extent of the assertions of Hahnemann and his party. In many instances he did not succeed, and was obliged to recur to the allopathic method. He exposes the inconsistencies and whimsical conceptions of Hahnemann in a very striking, though a lenient and even very superficial manner; evidently from his want of critical acuteness and depth of intellect; he appears also much influenced by the honour which he believes he has conferred on this doctrine, as well as by the great credit which he thinks due to him, being the first old medical author of reputation in Germany, who had subjected this mode of treatment to a trial and publicly confessed it. If this had not been the case, he would not have considered so short a time, exclusively spent in *private* practice, as sufficient for any certain opinion with regard to a treatment, totally at variance with common sense, with all rational principles and the experience of all ages. He would have adverted more particularly to some remarkable results of his experiments, obvious to the attentive reader of his works; for instance, that the homœopathic treatment proved to him chiefly effectual in chronic nervous complaints, which, as every physician knows, is any thing but a certain test of the worth of a specific treatment, since these complaints are frequently cured by mental impressions alone, or by the simultaneous use of coloured pump-water, bread pills, &c. Further, he always combined with the homœopathic treatment a strict diet, especially at the commencement of acute diseases, and, nevertheless, in most of them he

could not dispense with the old rational or allopathic treatment. In our opinion great credit is due to Dr. Kopp for his candor, but not for his talent. He has proved again in this, as he did in his earlier works on practical medicine, that he is incapable of an acute philosophical investigation: this is obvious also by the whole empirical tenor of this work, and even by its commencement, in § 1, where he suggests as an indirect vindication for homœopathia, "that the adoption of general indications (principles) has injured "the practice of medicine." Who would deny that this is not only true with regard to medicine, but, in a certain respect, more or less applicable also to all sciences, which are not founded on the certainty of mathematical calculations. Should we, for this reason, desist from trying to obtain general principles, and to free experiments from the illusions of our defective senses, and from all errors to which the human intellect has been and ever will be subjected? Should we therefore totally renounce the indispensable and beneficial influence of our higher mental capacities in all objects not palpable or measurable, and, by despairing to find during our short life what truth is, sanction mere empiricism, or trust to phantoms of credulity and superstition? It is true, Dr. Kopp's frank explanation of his predilection for homœopathia, appears to render his statement still more authentic; his love for truth must, indeed, be very great, since, favorably prepossessed as he was, he did not find every thing true in this marvellous doctrine. We may credit the facts as he states them, as we would the assertions of a man who, believing in the existence of ghosts, visits the church yard at midnight to see them, but says there were none there.

No lover of truth can assert, that the doctrines of practical medicine, erroneously termed systems, have either fully satisfied the higher requisites and faculties of the human mind, or the ardent and just wishes of the true philanthropist. Of what science, or of what art, even if it depends much less on conjecture and experience than medicine, can it be so truly said that, with the immense treasures of all the natural sciences, of which medicine is only a branch, and even with the great discoveries in anatomy and physiology, &c. practical medicine stands before us equally as uncertain, defective and chiefly dependent upon personal talent, as it did two thousand years ago? Let us ask any judicious and candid physician, if he himself should require profes-

sional assistance, and could choose from among all his colleagues, from Hippocrates down to the present age, whether he would not prefer the father of the healing art to any of his contemporaries, though Hippocrates could not even anticipate the innumerable later discoveries, any one of which would appear sufficiently important to advance medicine for centuries? Let him answer sincerely, if at liberty to select from among the celebrated physicians of the last three centuries, whether he would not at once prefer a Sydenham, Fredrick Hoffman or Boerhaave to any physician of the last twenty years, although these truly great men were ignorant of hundreds of the most valuable discoveries, more or less intimately connected with the healing art, and indispensable to the medical practice of the present age? It appears almost incredible, but it is nevertheless true, that medicine, one of the most important and fertile branches of natural science, in respect to its theory, and constantly cultivated by thousands of intelligent and well educated men, has generally remained unimproved in its practical application, and has almost become more uncertain and hazardous than before, whilst most other occupations have been, and are still, daily benefitted by the rapid progress of all sciences and arts. In this respect we are nearly forced to admit the reproaches of Hahnemann against practical medicine of all ages, if we could but depreciate the high degree of perfection which theoretical medicine has attained, the great advantages which practical medicine will amply derive therefrom, after abandoning rude empiricism and relying more upon true experience and philosophical inquiry; or if we could but reasonably admire an Herostratus, because he destroyed one of the greatest wonders of human art in antiquity, in order to secure himself a place in history, as the author of homœopathia attempts with rational medicine.

The profession would be indebted to Hahnemann, not only for the discovery of some new remedies and the specific actions of some older ones on the human body, but also in general for his exposing the common track of medical practice and urging the great necessity of improving it, had he examined with genuine critical talent and faithful love of truth, the hitherto prominent systems and methods of practical medicine, and had he not wantonly endeavoured to destroy all rational principles in this science and all learning belonging to it, in substituting for both, whimsical conceptions

and suggestions, drawn from a comparatively few, defective and partial experiments.*

* Our remarks in these pages, and many other facts may prove that our opposition to homœopathia arises neither from orthodox partiality for any medical system, nor from predilection for any particular mode of medical practice. Faithful homœopathists excepted, there is hardly a professional man, engaged as we have been in an extensive hospital, dispensary, and private practice for upwards of thirty years, who, though faithfully selecting from all systems whatever appeared to him the most useful, has pursued, more than ourselves, a mode, which in many respects would have made him partial for the homœopathic doctrine, if there had been any trace of common sense in it. In order briefly to substantiate our assertion, we would state, that in the whole of our practice we have never prescribed six venesections, nor about fifty emetics, nor five pounds of cathartic salts, nor five ounces of jalap, nor two bottles of castor oil, nor one pound of Peruvian-bark in substance, and so in proportion to other drugs which are commonly used in large doses by physicians of all schools ; thus also for instance, croup excepted, we have never prescribed more than three grains of calomel at a dose, and delirium tremens excepted, never more than three grains of opium; though the above mentioned extent of our private practice alone, yielded at an average, not less than fifty patients per day. We may say that, when some of our colleagues scarcely reflected on drachms to be given, we weighed grains, and one drop of laudanum more or less in a mixture of six ounces, or one grain of camphor was an object of high consideration for us ; as experience has clearly taught us from the beginning of our career, at the age of eighteen, that in no human occupation the conceptions of smallness and largeness prove to be more relative than in practical medicine, and that, to a certain reasonable extent, the smallest dose of a medicine may be too large, the largest too small. We were therefore, also in favor of the most powerful drugs, and of very large doses when smaller ones did no service, and our patients were generally the best customers of the apothecaries.—We should plead ourselves guilty of the grossest quackery, did we claim greater talents than others, or boldly assert, that by our deviating so far from all methods of treatment, generally adopted, we have always only witnessed its salutary effects. But we should feel ungrateful towards the mercy of Providence, bestowed upon our exertions, and should believe ourselves possessed of a too refined egotism, if, from misplaced professional delicacy and from too anxiously avoiding the unjust reproach of public ostentation, we should withhold the truth, which, in our present situation, can only be useful to others, and to which many of our former respected colleagues at Altona and Hamburg, and the large enlightened communities of both those cities, will not refuse to testify. We have reason to acknowledge with pious gratitude, that generally, the results, of our treatment were by no means behind those of others, but in many respects distinguished by a comparatively short convalescence and durable health after recovery; results which are only observable when a physician has retained for a long series of years the same residence, and has enjoyed during so long a time the most unrestricted confidence of many families. We may unconsciously possess prejudices as all men do more or less,—homo sum et humani nil a me alienum puto—but in doing justice to ourselves, we confess that we have always been particularly anxious to destroy all those prejudices which might in any way influence our vocation ; being aware that truth and error are not dependent upon authorities of men and upon the majority of votes, nor upon the length of their duration; that among all conjectural sciences none is more uncertain and liable to prejudice, errors and mistakes than the healing art, and that it might be more pardonable to any other than to a physician, conscientiously reflecting on the important sequels of his arduous vocation, wilfully to entertain prejudices, and to worship the suggestions of others, may they be ever so much supported by delusive facts, in being opposed to his own judgment and his faithful experiments.

Our views of medical practice, however, agree with some of Hahnemann's fanciful conceptions, not simply in attention to minutiæ; for, upwards of thirty-five years ago, when the cow-pox was first known as a preventive against small-pox, having been actively engaged in vaccination, we opposed and have continued to oppose the erroneous mode of its propagation as generally adopted and hitherto pursued by the profession, from reasons similar in some respect, to the suggestions of Hahnemann. Our repeated sad predictions, in private as well as in public, especially those made in a treatise published 1822, and entitled, "On the dangers of the measures hitherto adopted for the propagation of cow-pox.—(Die Gefahren der bisher befolgten Maas-

Having been for upwards of thirty years engaged in an extensive public and private practice, we have attended closely to all that has happened around us in the profession, and we have at least been anxious not to be prepossessed by any prejudice against any suggestion from abroad, or from any source whatever, if it appeared to us consistent with reason and experience. Educated in the old gastric school, we commenced practice at a time when John Brown's system of medicine was much admired and followed in Germany. It appeared to us that this doctrine, though many of its tenets had been alluded to long before by Friederich Hoffman, Ernst Stahl and some other distinguished authors, was founded on some highly important rational principles of physiology and pathogeny. We however soon observed that, even with the great changes and improvements made in this doctrine by eminent German professors in philosophy and medicine, it was too narrow in its explanations of the conditions of human life during the healthy and diseased states, and that most of our contemporaries, who were then implicitly devoted to this doctrine, applied it without impartial judgment, without due regard to the contradictory ex-

regeln zur Verbreitung der Kuhpocken,) have since been confirmed by many professional men, viz: that the cow-pox, in itself a munificent gift of Providence, by its unquestionable protection against the destructive small-pox, when pure and properly managed, has become, by the negligence and carelessness of the medical profession and the public authorities, one of the greatest scourges with which mankind was ever afflicted; for it has not merely ceased to be protective, but, if things continue as they are, we may predict with great probability, that in less than half a century, almost every one will be affected by one or more dyscrasiæ, from the indifference of most physicians, and the ignorance of the public, whether their healthy child be vaccinated from another, who is perfectly healthy, or with vaccine-virus, perhaps contaminated by syphilis, itch, herpes, scrophulosis, &c. We repeat it frankly, the cow-pox has, merely from the reasons mentioned, ceased to protect against small-pox; notwithstanding, by professional caprice, the term varioloid or any other name be applied to the eruptive disease, which in many cases deforms and destroys like the small-pox. Parents bereaved by varioloid, may be temporarily comforted by tables of mortality, showing that cow-pox protects against small-pox; but the time will come, when the public and the profession will be awake to this subject. We only hope, that it will be soon enough, to prevent the imprecations of posterity upon their ancestors, and upon a discovery, which could have done them so much benefit, and has done them so great and almost irreparable injury. Without many verified documents, posterity would not believe, that in an age, when thousands have been so infatuated as to admit, that spirits and miracles may be developed from the many millionth part of a grain of table salt, charcoal, flint, &c., by mere triturations and shakings, the proportionally million times larger quantity of a syphilitic or any other infectious matter, contained in a drop of cow-pox lymph, and multiplied by the immensely more powerful processes of the living human body, should have been regarded as nothing! Had Hahnemann ever seriously reflected on this subject, which approaches so near to his singular conceptions about the immense action of the smallest doses of drugs, and still more so to his foolish theory of all chronic diseases, that it is almost incredible, how he and all his followers could have missed it; he would have amply compensated for all his impositions and absurdities, in using his unmerited authority, for the protection of millions against such great injuries.—Hahnemann is, on the contrary, rather partial to unrestrained vaccination, and opposed to revaccination, which should be instituted after purberty, from reasons suggested and published by us, in Rust's Magaz. d. ges. Heilk., Berlin, 1827.

perience of past times and of their dissenting fellow-practitioners, and therefore to the manifest injury of their patients. With regard to the theory of Brown's doctrine, it must have been obvious to every unprejudiced observer, that the living body, in its healthy and diseased state, could not be dependent only upon the plus or minus relation between its excitability and external stimulants generally, without regard to the specific quality of the latter, the specific structure, and the thereby specifically modified excitability of the single systems and organs; and that neither the rude conceptions of the Brunonian in regard to nature, considering himself her master, could be true, nor that the lancet, opium, brandy, and a few similar articles could be the only remedies granted by Providence for the great variety of diseases. The important objection made by Brown's opposers to one of his fundamental principles, viz. that all vital action must be considered only as the result of the correlative inverse ratio between the excitability and the stimulant, was never answered satisfactorily by its defenders, although if this proposition were true, it would be difficult to comprehend the existence of any dynamic disease. On the other side Brown himself, however unbiassed by almost all other acknowledged professional dogmas,—as all reformers in medicine or those who pretend to be so usually are,—believed in the existence of a state termed general hypersthenia. This opinion, though adopted by all medical schools, appears nevertheless contrary to the laws of nature, inasmuch as any machine, living or not, cannot be diminished or disturbed the least in its total action by the *proportionally* increased strength of *all* its single parts; this implying rather a state, which must be less subjected to any derangement than any other state imaginable. The judicious physician, however, aware of this and similar defects and inconsistencies of that medical theory, some fundamental principles of which will last as long as rational physiology and practical medicine shall exist, may they be ever so much neglected for a short time—will be better satisfied with its cautious application, than with many vague conceptions and prescriptions of the older schools. It was principally the rude manner in which Brown, and his followers more particularly, ventured to apply his energetic mode of treatment, that caused the sudden downfall of a doctrine which at first had been received with so much enthusiasm by the most distinguished practitioners, and which had promised to last for centuries. This doctrine gave way after a comparatively short

existence to another method, which, accordant to similar epochs in the history of medicine immediately following each other, was quite the opposite, instead of avoiding the faults and mistakes, and improving the truths and benefits of its predecessor. When the orthodox Brunonist imagined every one of his patients lost by asthenia, unless saved by madeira, opium or bark, his succeeding younger colleagues or he himself, witnessing the frequent failures and disasters of their former method, became converted into orthodox antiphlogists or gastricists; they considered all diseases as arising from a general superabundance of blood, from a diathesis inflammatoria or orgasmus, or also from a morbidly increased accumulation of bile, mucus, &c., which were either quite imaginary or rested on delusive symptoms only. Without regard to the true causes of these different symptoms, they neglected properly to value the general as well as specific actions of the vital power, as partly dependent upon and modified by the different tissues and their sympathetical connexions, which jointly constitute the living functions of the animal and particularly of the human body. The profession, overlooking, more than ever, all other causes of diseases, now again presumed in most patients an inflammation, subinflammation, or changes dependent upon them. The results of most post mortem examinations, seldom failed to confirm such a state of things supposed during life, and to demonstrate some discoloured, indurated or suppurated part; and frequently in this manner a new species of "*itis*" was created, in order to swell still more the large catalogue of these kinds of diseases, which appear at present to be almost the only ones by which the human race is afflicted. It will without doubt be conclusively proved by posterity, that pathological anatomy,—which if duly appreciated is not only extremely valuable, but indispensable to the practice of medicine, especially as it has thrown so much light in modern ages on the diagnosis of many diseases,—has, particularly in our times, frequently been made of immense injury, by over-valuing its results, and by causing false conclusions, drawn from one state of things, *death*, to be applied to another one widely different, *life*. The secret recesses of the animal body, wherein the processes of life have been performed, will always remain inaccessible to the scalpel of the anatomist, and when a post mortem examination shows correctly to the minute investigator the seat of the fatal disease, he will nevertheless remain ignorant of its cause and developement.

"Omnia incerta et in naturæ majestate abdita. (Plin. hist. nat. "Lib. 2.") It deserves also particular notice, that such examinations are seldom instituted without previous medical treatment, and that therefore, besides the great difference which must exist between the commencement of a disease and its termination, after days, weeks, or even months have elapsed; the state of things should not be considered as unmixed and only as the consequence of the disease itself, but also as the possible result of the treatment. False opinions of the very nature of many diseases have thus been sanctioned for a much longer time than they would otherwise have been, and have greatly injured the true advancement of the profession.

The history of medicine will justly censure the rude empiricism into which the profession has relapsed at a period, so distinguished by many valuable discoveries in all the natural sciences, and will record also the singular fact that those discoveries, particularly in natural philosophy, chemistry, anatomy and physiology, which might have improved practical medicine, should have remained, almost unnoticed by the same nation, whose Blumenbach, Burdach, Tiedemann, Treviranus and others had continued, with unparalleled zeal and success, the great work commenced by Albertus Haller, the father of physiology. Now and then old controversies of a general interest to practical medicine were renewed, but in a manner unworthy of the great progress in physiology and chemistry; for instance, the disputes between the solidists and the humoral pathologists, and especially with regard to the former, whether the action of the nervous system should be considered as the only exciting and regulating power in the living animal economy, or not. Of the number of professors and authors on practical medicine there were, in our times, but few, who thought with more true philosophical acuteness and consistency, that animal life in general, especially its physical functions, should be considered as particularly influenced by the universal powers of nature; that all the single systems, organs and parts of the living animal, are more or less endowed with the same power, and that their various functions depend upon their particular primitive and subsequent formation and chemical composition, by which their attractive and repulsive powers, or their living electro-chemical processes, as well as their other manifestations of life, are only modified and diversified, so as to form an harmonious or inharmonious indi-

vidual whole, in the healthy and diseased state. The majority of the profession recommenced, on a larger scale than before, to treat diseases merely upon symptoms, which were generally connected only accidentally with the cause of the symptoms, or, at least were incident also to opposite causes, instead of considering all the constituent parts of the living body, from the brain down to the excrementitious matter not yet excreted, as possessing life; although all these single parts constituting the living whole, pro tem., gradually increase in their importance, from the excrementitious matter and the hair, bones, blood, &c., up to the brain, by which the finite or material world is reciprocally connected with the infinite or immaterial empire of ideas, feelings, imagination and volition.—Thus, if a vigorous individual is suddenly attacked with symptoms of pleurisy or of inflammation of the brain, liver, &c., after mental excitement or after the abuse of spirituous drinks, &c., immediately previous to a cold, &c. it is not considered worth while minutely to examine the causes, and to distinguish whether the case is a *genuine* inflammation of the serous coat of the lungs, of the brain, &c., or whether it is only a catarrhal, rheumatic or a similar affection, arising from a checked or perverse conductive capacity of the nervous system, which may be easily reestablished without resorting to violent measures; no, the whole morbid process is instantaneously considered as a violent inflammation, arising from a superabundance or an orgasmus of the blood, though no one can demonstrate what cause could well have generated an orgasmus, or much less have increased so suddenly the quantity of blood. Supposing even this conjecture right, and the local inflammation to be unquestionably a genuine one, though no well educated physician will totally deny the necessity of large bleedings or other reasons, no regard is paid to the plain objection which might be raised against all large general abstractions of blood, viz. that they cannot remedy the disease directly, on account of the simple fact, that, if an even quantity be deducted from an uneven one, the unevenness must naturally remain the same as before, and that the most valuable material for all vital exertions, the blood, is lost in addition, frequently without any other advantage than the chance offered to the energetic constitution and the good fortune of the patient to overcome, not only the disease itself, but also the bad effect of the injudicious treatment. A few such cases, from which the patients fortunately escaped, are held forth as the tro

phies of the art; many faithfully recorded as fatal, either immediately or after a lingering chronic disease, are attributed to other accidents by the followers of the dominant method, and thousands fall victims to the same ill treatment without being noticed. When after a short delusive relief by bleeding, cupping, leeching, purging, &c., the symptoms again become aggravated, though nothing could justify the opinion of a renewed increase of blood, &c., one would suppose that these fancied causes would henceforth remain out of the question, and that the patient would be subjected to another treatment; far from this, the lancet, cathartics, &c. are again and again employed, until the poor sufferer is reduced to the utmost, and the physician, suddenly inspired by meek devotion, invokes the aid of the same healing power of nature, to the voice of which he was quite deaf a few hours previous, or which he considered shortly before as impotent, though this very healing power of nature, properly supported and directed, would probably have saved the patient, whom now all those invocations and all the large doses of ether, musk, opium and bark are unable to restore. The grossest misconceptions continued to prevail in the practice of medicine at the time, when the great discoveries about electro-chemical processes should have attracted the closest attention of the practitioner, in order to enlighten his conceptions in regard to causes of disease and the action of drugs. This great agent, attending most if not all the operations of physical nature, producing immense effects in the most subtile manner, and with means apparently quite disproportionate, seems to have attracted hitherto only the attention of the natural philosopher and chemist, although the highly important identity of electricity and magnetism, as discovered by Oersted, the undeniable and remarkable phenomena of animal magnetism, and the structure and functions of the nervous system from its first lineaments to its perfect developement, so much elucidated in modern times by Bichat, Bell, Magendie, Tiedemann, and others, should have led to different results in regard to the treatment of diseases in general, and more particularly to the quantities, in which drugs may be properly administered. Disregarding the two golden maxims, "quid fieri potest per pauca non fieri debet "per multa," and "omne nimium vertitur in contrarium," almost every patient, if dangerously ill, resembles, in the eyes of the physician, a strong castle, with its obstinate commander, in a protracted siege, to be destroyed and levelled rather than preserved

and conquered by skilful and prudent manœuvres and negotiations;—his principal object appears to subdue the disease at all events, without thinking, that in consequence of the violent measures taken, and the surplus of powerful drugs given, the patient might either die, or suffer through his whole life, with all the pains and inconveniences of a broken constitution.

Even the two lateral branches of medicine, surgery and obstetrics, both so intimately connected with and dependent on the former, have not derived advantages proportionate to the great progress which they have made in their own spheres within the last thirty years, only on account of the stationary or rather retrograde state of practical medicine within the same period.

Operative surgery has in itself attained in our present times, by distinguished men in every civilized nation, a degree of perfection hardly imagined in former ages. The diagnosis of surgical cases has been greatly improved, and operations successfully executed, which justly claim the greatest respect and gratitude for the skill, talents and dexterity of many eminent surgeons of the present age; but with regard to the preservation of the human frame by judicious medico-chirurgical treatment, either to prevent the necessity of painful and dangerous operations, or to ensure their success by a circumspect after-treatment, we venture to assert that the results are by no means equal to what they might be. Although not a practical surgeon, we have known many cases to prove fatal, where in all probability by a less active or at least by a better mode of medical after-treatment, life woul dhave been saved, or where the unfortunate patient would have recovered without being mutilated and deformed. The minute diagnosis of the different species of strangulated hernia for instance, has been so astonishingly improved by the great talents and united exertions of men like Scarpa, Astley Cooper, Dupuytren, Hesselbach and others, that we can consider this important chapter of practical surgery, not only as quite different from what it was a century ago, but as almost perfect. Are the results of these great improvements, proportionally more fortunate than those of past ages, when such cases were so roughly handled by rude empirics? We venture to say, by no means. Many, endangered by the premature operation for strangulated hernia, could have been saved, either without any operation, by a judicious medical treatment, or at least after the necessary operation had been circumspectly performed, if the common pernicious opinion

had not prevailed, that the patient must immediately swallow immense doses of salts, castor oil, calomel, jalap, &c., and be submitted indiscriminately to repeated bleedings, leeching, &c., in order to enforce at all hazards the natural functions of the bowels, which had been so long morbidly affected and severely injured. No attention is paid to the more reasonable supposition, strikingly confirmed by daily experience, that nothing is more beneficial, and that nothing can more contribute to restore the healthy functions of any organ which has suffered by a disease or by a painful operation, than rest, and the careful removal of any thing which might force it to perform its functions, which according to the laws of nature, must always remain morbidly affected or suspended for a certain time after the mechanical hindrance has been removed by art. How many fractured bones, after being well set, might have been quickly and safely cured by a proper medical treatment, instead of which the patients have suffered for years, at the risk of loosing the limb at last by amputation, under more aggravated circumstances than in the beginning, or have remained through life lame and sickly, in consequence of the methodical ill-treatment which was intended to prevent danger, but which really caused it! This is plainly seen by impartially analyzing such a course, and by considering what would probably be the natural effect upon the stoutest labourer, who while enjoying perfect health should be confined at once to a bed with a diet of gruel, lemonade and a little toast; then largely bled, leeched, purged; the next day forced to swallow repeated large doses of anodynes; then bled again, and so alternately for a week only! Every one will admit that such a man will fall dangerously ill, and that perhaps he will be affected with some local complaint, as erysipelas, rheumatism, or the like. Will not this be much more the case if he has unfortunately fractured a limb? Can it be wondered at, that under such improper treatment, frequently pursued by eminent surgeons, the patient soon becomes feverish, delirious, and perhaps even, at an unfavorable season, affected by locked-jaw, that all the functions become disordered, that the limb while yet morbidly affected by the mechanical injury and the local irritation, is forced to become the centre of a general sympathetical morbid reaction of all the systems and many important organs; that by this the fracture does not join after many months, though it would have perhaps been cured in six weeks; or the local inflammation being artificially protracted, and transmuted

into an asthenic one, instead of the secretion of fluids, rich with sound fibrin and osseous substance, and well adapted for a healthy substantial callus, sanies becomes secreted, fistula, caries, &c., ensue; and at last, if amputation does not fortunately check all these destructive processes, incurable consumption follows? The great number of middle-aged individuals with mutilated limbs, which are not caused by war or any similar calamity, now more common than formerly, in large cities, show that the surgeons of our age are generally more skilful in cutting off a limb, than in preserving it, though it may easily be proved that in most of these cases the loss of a limb postpones, merely for a number of years, premature death, and that its preservation is therefore to be considered an indicatio vitalis, as much as the amputation generally is.

The case is nearly the same with the practice of midwifery, notwithstanding the great improvements made in this branch of medicine by many distinguished professors and authors. Without pretending to judge of the minutiæ of an art which we have never practically pursued, we may however notice, that we seldom met with accoucheurs, who did not abuse the application of instruments or other artificial aid, in cases which nature alone would have overcome with ease, if sufficient time had been allowed her. This is particularly the case in countries where this art is not entrusted to the care of well instructed women, who in many cases not requiring professional interference, are naturally more disposed to wait patiently, as they know by their own experience, the slow but safe operation of nature better than men, who generally engaged in a large medical and surgical practice, frequently neglect one of their duties by overhastening. Most accoucheurs are also anxious to interfere improperly with the natural expulsion of the placenta, which, as sound physiological principles and many experiences demonstrate, may mostly be left to nature herself, with great benefit to the confined woman; few urgent and tedious cases excepted, which the enlightened art has minutely defined, but which never should form a general rule. In the medical treatment of the lying-in-woman great and very obnoxious prejudices still prevail. Hæmorrhages are now generally checked, without regard to the great variety of causes, by bleeding, cold water, ice, and by the strongest astringents, applied internally and externally; the rational accoucheur of former times removed them perhaps not as quickly, but safer by the tincture of cinnamon,

small doses of laudanum, ipecacuanha, refracta dosi, and by other remedies appropriate to the different prevailing causes. Many accoucheurs at present do not generally consider, although they may quickly remove the prominent symptom, yet that the immediate and still more the later consequences are often very serious. Thus, to say nothing of subsequent sterility, many chronic diseases of the uterus at a late age, such as polypus, scirrhus, cancer, &c., which are now more frequent than ever, and increase yearly at a shocking ratio, (see Siebold's Journal, f. Geburtsh. Vol. VIII., No. 3,) are partly caused by the illtreatment referred to, and by many similar prescriptions, dictated by a rude empiricism. Other causes, moral as well as physical, which we shall perhaps quote occasionally, may be the reason why young married ladies are now more affected in their health and beauty after one pregnancy, than their ancestors were after a dozen, though many other professional and popular prejudices respecting puberty, pregnancy, labour and confinement, and the present defective system of education, bear undoubtedly a part of the charges.*

* By combining the practice of medicine with that of surgery and midwifery, the progress of the former has been much impeded. An impartial observer, who does not believe that the mental capacities of men have improved much during the last centuries, must think it strange, that with the immensely increased extent of all medical and surgical sciences, practical medicine and practical surgery are at present combined in the same person in most countries; it was formerly but seldom the case, and does not exist now so extensively in England and France, as in Germany and other countries. The history of literature and arts may raise the question, whether the intellectual capacities of individuals are as great now as formerly, particularly if we do justice to our ancestors, and consider the much greater difficulties which they had to encounter and their far more limited means. The answer will unquestionably be still more in favor of our ancestors, also in regard to their literary acquirements, if we reflect on the stupendous works of men, as Martin Luther, Grævius, Friedrich Hoffmann, Linné, Albertus Haller, &c., some of which are so voluminous that copying them only, would almost require more than one man's life. The present connexion of practical medicine with surgery must be still more remarkable to one who reflects, that the father of the healing art emphatically exclaimed, upwards of twenty-five centuries ago, "how short is human life, and how long the art!" and who reflects also that, in modern times, nothing has more promoted the rapid improvements in almost all branches of industry than the division of labor. We must admit, that all nations of high standing may pride themselves upon possessing few men equally distinguished by their great acquirements and talents in medicine as well as in surgery, and that in general the people, especially when their number is but small in comparison to their extent of country, could rather dispense with good physicians than with good surgeons, and will derive much greater benefit from their professional men, if they can officiate as physicians equally as well as surgeons and accoucheurs. In general, however, as Providence has prominently distinguished certain nations with particular moral and intellectual dispositions and feelings, and as no nation can, with propriety, claim to combine in her natural character the virtues, talents and acquirements of all the others, so Providence has also seldom endowed one individual with the qualifications necessary for medical practice and for the other two sciences, which must be considered more as arts and therefore as belonging together. The natural dispositions for the physicians on one side, and for the surgeon and accoucheur on the other, differ widely. Medicine depends more prominently upon a disposition for abstract philosophical inquiries, upon a lively imagination and sympathy; the other two more

With this brief sketch of the practice of medicine in our age, to which we shall occasionally add a few remarks, the dissatisfaction

particularly upon a faithful memory, upon mechanical ingenuity and dexterity, and upon a certain degree of apathy. The surgeon has generally to operate upon the human body, when suddenly injured by some mechanical power, while enjoying health; the physician is more commonly called in, after a succession of causes, and their correspondent effects, have long undermined the free vital actions of the body. The province of the physician is more in the injured, or rather restricted actions of the dynamical relations of the human body, more or less involved in mystery, and therefore mostly objects of conjecture ; the provinces of the other two are more the mechanical hindrances and checks to the healthy functions of the human body, which are much more palpable and consequently are more readily discerned. Farther, while the surgeon is easily misled by a too lively imagination, the talented physician cannot do without it, since he must form an intellectual picture of the state of things, frequently less dependent upon previous events and present phenomena, than upon his sympathy with the feelings and sensations of the patient. Fr. Bacon says, very properly, in his work de Augment. Scient: "Quare apud poëtas summa ratione musica cum "medicina in Apolline conjungitur; quia similis fere sit utriusque artis genius; atque "in ea consistat plane medici officium, ut sciat corporis humani lyram ita tendere et "pulsare, ut reddatur concentus minime discors et insuavis." No one thoroughly acquainted with the profession, will depreciate surgery, and can deny the high credit due to the accomplished surgeon, especially now that surgery has attained so much perfection, and since so many are saved from premature death, or from a painful miserable existence, merely by surgical skill. One severe case of typhus or scarlet fever, of consumption, paralysis, &c., however, requires more philosophical acuteness and depth, than most surgical operations, though, to a certain extent, the mistakes of the physician are frequently much more ameliorated by the aid of nature than those of the surgeon, since the slightest awkward or injudicious movement of the surgeon may endanger the life of his patient, and his ignorance in the treatment of a dislocated or fractured limb &c., can never be repaired by the aid of nature. From their different natural dispositions and occupations we find therefore, generally, that eminent surgeons either undervalue all medical assistance, or, when acting as physicians, decide too quickly ; they are much more in favor of too powerful and too large doses of drugs, paying less regard to minutiæ than the physician, who, devoting his life exclusively to medical practice, has learned by it, that one ounce of blood unnecessarily abstracted, or one drop of laudanum improperly applied, may frequently decide on life and death. The surgeon generally deals by wholesale with the vital power, the physician more by retail, and we seldom find even wholesale merchants and retailers equally attentive to minutiæ and equally successful in exchanging one kind of business for the other. It would materially injure the surgeon, and degrade him to a level with the lowest mechanic, if he were not thoroughly acquainted with the whole extent of the medical profession ; and no well educated physician can dispense with a minute knowledge of surgery; but where it is possible to separate the practice of both, it will prove highly beneficial to the public, directly and indirectly, as both will be advanced. During the last twenty years the students of medicine direct their attention more to surgery than to the acquirements of a philosophical insight into the theory of medicine, which would best promote the elevation of their minds over a rude empiricism. The complaints made upwards of a century ago by one of the greatest practitioners and ablest medical authors, have become again but too true. Bernh. Ramazzini says, in his Oper. "quando nostra hac ætate medicina ad mecha-"nismum tota pæne redacta est, et scholæ nil magis quam automatismum crepant" It would not be difficult for an author, abler than ourselves, by minutely reviewing the medical literature in the present age, to prove that medicine, by its amalgamation with surgery, has rather adopted all the features of the latter, by relying more exclusively on the palpable, especially if he should advert to the numerous medical and surgical periodicals of England, France and Germany, and the proportional scarcity of original medical works like those of Sydenham, Portal, J. P. Frank, Benjamin Rush, &c., which are truly valuable for their abstracts of minute investigations during a long and exclusively medical practice. An extensive periodical literature must be considered as proving, that education and learning are extensively diffused, as we may judge from the quantity of newspapers of the lively interest which a people is permitted to take in its political institutions, or really takes in its self-government. Where the periodical literature of a certain science, which embraces many votaries

of many young physicians, aware of the many and great professional desiderata on commencing practice, could easily be explained, and would do honor to their intellect as well as to their humanity and professional zeal. A large field is open to them, to find out less hazardous andmore rational modes of cure, the materials for which exist in the voluminous writings of many distinguished authors, from Hippocrates down to the present time, and also in the immense treasures, offered to the philosophical and scrutinizing physician, by the high degree of perfection which all the natural sciences, and especially physiology and pathological anatomy, have attained. But should the young physician, misled by ignorant fanatics, or by men who, being inconscious of the high duties of their vocation, are anxious only to satisfy their morbid fancy or low interest, reject all closer investigations after truth, as mere "learned lumber;" and should he prefer to listen to the rudest empiricism, rather than to the dictates of rational medicine, to the temptations of a miserable quackery rather than to the warning voices of his conscience and of so many distinguished physicians

does not succeed, there the low standing of professional education cannot be doubted, because well educated men of every profession must keep pace with the new discoveries and interesting suggestions in their profession. But inasmuch as a great statesman cannot be formed or become satisfied only by the perusal of newspapers, so too in regard to sciences, no solid knowledge can be drawn from periodicals and reviews only; they promote a superficial knowledge of scientific objects, and produce, as has been proved in modern times in respect to medicine, many vague suggestions, frequently not confirmed by experience. It is however evident that no other science or art can in this respect be compared with medicine and surgery, since in no other vocation is the neglect of study so injurious. The artist, if unacquainted with the latest discoveries and improvements in his art, will injure himself only, or may thus even preserve his originality; the lawyer, if he is not a distinguished scientific man, an author or a professor, may easily be satisfied by knowing the few alterations made in the laws and statutes, and, like the clergyman, who is thoroughly versed in his professional studies before entering into office, he may consider his continued study more as valuable means to improve his intellect, and as an amusement worthy of his refined taste and of his vocation, rather than as a duty. But the conscientious physician and surgeon should not be satisfied with the knowledge they attained before their examination and graduation: and no patient will be contented with the knowledge of his physician acquired thirty or forty years ago, nor be satisfied if he remains uncured, or is even materially injured, because his doctor has lost a good share of the old stock by the lapse of so many years, and has remained ignorant of the many improvements and discoveries made during so long a period; certainly not! he silently wishes and is entitled to demand, that he may be saved or relieved by all the means which the profession offers at the moment he calls for its aid, whether this be practicable only by a new discovery or suggestion recently made in his own or in any foreign country. Both the physician and surgeon are therefore bound to continue their study, and free themselves from the reproach of being, from neglected study, in many cases, the negative cause of great mischief and injury. Every impartial and intelligent layman will find it difficult to comprehend how this can be done by a man, even if possessing extraordinary mental capacities, talents, &c., when he is engaged day and night in his his practice as a physician, a surgeon, an accoucheur, and perhaps also as an apothecary and druggist. Is not indeed our life *a little* too short, to perform all these important duties conscientiously?

of all ages: he will repent, when too late, the irreparable loss of his own happiness, by having entered the hygieian temple unprepared for such an arduous task.

The reason why so many young men enter the medical profession unaware of its extraordinary requisites and duties, and feel, at a later period of their life, unhappy in the choice of their vocation, may principally be ascribed to the total ignorance of the public in regard to medicine generally. No art, no science is indeed more unknown to laymen, although in none they are more deeply interested and of none they pretend to judge better. The true and only cause of this is the want of proper information with regard to the different sciences belonging to the study of medicine, and especially to the want of a general philosophical education, which is so much neglected in our time, although so indispensable to all special scientific investigations, not only generally for the formation of a sound judgment, but also for the acquisition of a proper insight into the foundation and structure of all the sciences and arts. We therefore frequently hear the most absurd assertions about the profession and its practitioners, and see particular confidence placed in the unlearned and uneducated, whose conceptions and prejudices harmonize more with those of the public, and who are devoid of that discreet and unaffected modesty and dignity which always distinguish the man of education and real talent, and which render him less familiar with common-place topics. These are the principal reasons why the profession is highly valued only among the rudest and the most civilized nations, while its standing is the lowest among those, whose state of civilization is more calculated for useful knowledge than for general philosophical inquiries into scientific matters, especially if the legal requisites for entering the profession are at the same time trifling, so that a large stock of professional men is always at command. The large number of popular treatises on the cure of diseases has also contributed much to perpetuate noxious prejudices and to promote very defective knowledge, which is much worse than none at all, whenever the great difference of two or more apparently similar cases depends on minute distinctions, derivable only from an intimate knowledge of the separate departments of the art. Very few and urgent cases excepted, in nine times out of ten, the adoption of prescriptions recommended in such works leads to mischief much greater, than if nature is left undis-

turbed, especially as such prescriptions are generally unconditional, and by not adverting to the great importance of the different causes, promote the obnoxious opinion, that all medical practice consists only in the close observation of the symptoms, and in the application of the medicines recommended by the profession for the different names of diseases. This erroneous opinion has principally paved the way for the zealous adoption of homœopathia by many in Germany, the well educated and judicious physicians excepted. Of all medical doctrines hitherto promulgated, no one tends to promote prejudices against rational medicine more than homœopathia, although the present time is particularly propitious for enlightening the public, and for restricting also the detrimental abuse of powerful domestic medicines.

During the long interregnum of rational medicine, and the prevalence of many favourable circumstances, the author of homœpathia, even with his moderate talents, might have much promoted practical medicine, if he had tried to confirm some of his discoveries by impartial experiments, and to combine them with the indispensable requisites of the rational healing art, instead of destroying the latter in a manner unparalleled in the history of any science, since the restoration of the sciences and arts, and worthy only of a scientific Vandalism. That this has been the course of Hahnemann and his followers, we feel particularly bound to prove, by the following review of the principles or rather maxims of homœopathia; these maxims are—

1st. All simple drugs given to individuals in health, produce in them, under all circumstances, certain definite morbid symptoms, which are termed drug-symptoms, and which are similar to the symptoms observable in certain corresponding natural diseases.

2nd. The direct curative power of each simple drug, and of all medicines generally, consists exactly and exclusively in the similarity of the symptoms of a natural disease to their corresponding drug-symptoms, or to those produced in healthy individuals, by administering certain simple drugs to them; so that all other operations of drugs are to be considered as capable only of admitting recovery indirectly, or by chance.

3d. All natural substances, but especially all drugs acquire, by certain mechanical processes, certain medicinal powers, so that any quantity of the substance or drug in question, however small, will always operate absolutely and unconditionally as an effectual remedy

in its appropriate disease, by its specific power properly developed, which power or virtue, however, increases ad infinitum, in the direct ratio of the mechanical processes mentioned, and in the inverse ratio of the quantity of the substance.

To give a complete view of this doctrine, we must mention its author's theory of all chronic diseases, published in 1828, about eighteen years after the first edition of his Organon, and twenty-three years after his publication of the homœopathic doctrine. We shall see hereafter, that in this new work, he has contradicted and explicitly retracted the second fundamental maxim of homœopathia, so that his doctrine, as it now stands, should be called Hahnemannism, rather than homœopathia.

At the very commencement of all homœopathic doctrines, viz. the experiments of simple drugs upon healthy individuals, we meet with the great difficulty arising from Hahnemann's moral and scientific duplicity. To say nothing of the true conditions of perfect health, which, in its strict physiological sense, is seldom met with, and not ascertainable unless the person is thoroughly known to the experimentalist from his infancy: wherever experiments had been instituted by his opposers, exactly according to his first directions, and had proved abortive, he and his followers alleged, as a chief cause, the erroneous opinion entertained by these opposers, that *homœopathic* doses of a drug should affect healthy persons. They afterwards stated, that to observe the truth of their experiments, it was necessary to apply the simple drugs in question in *large allopathic* doses, (see Hahnemann's Organon, 4th edit. § 120 and 121, Dr. Moritz Mueller in Archiv fuer Homœopathische Heilkunde, Vol. III. No. 1, p. 30, Dr. Gross, ibid, No. 3, p. 133, Dr. Rummel, ibid, Vol. V. No. 1, p. 14.) Dr. Hering also alludes to this, when he says, (l. c. p. 14), "medicines do not become salu-" tary by their direct effects, such as are manifested in experiments " on healthy persons after strong and frequent doses, &c." When these experiments, thus altered by Hahnemann's explicit advice had led his opposers again to results totally different from his statements, and he found it difficult to verify other assertions of his doctrine, he decided again in favor of his first suggestion of *homœopathic* doses. In this manner the author of the Concise View repeals and contradicts, also (l. c. p. 20), his statements just quoted, by saying: " But now its energies were developed, and displayed " so penetrating and powerful an influence upon the healthy

" subject of experiment, that the trials with it appertained to the " most difficult and assaulting, so that higher developments were " obliged to be made for further experiments; and for remedial " purposes the developments were continued up to the thirtieth " power." Hahnemann himself explains this still more distinctly, saying, when speaking of table-salt (Chron. Dis. Vol. IV. p. 276), " All these statements refer to trials generally instituted on robust " and healthy persons, with two or three doses of six little sugar- " pellets, moistened with the decillionth developed power. Only " when tried on healthy persons, in such a high degree of develop- " ment and solution, all other remedies also are capable of dis- " playing their powers." It is evident that these contradictory assertions cannot be reconciled with common sense. Suppose that A, when speaking of a substance, should say to B, test the truth of my experiment, by taking once only the billionth part of a grain of it, and B tried it without experiencing the desired effect; now A ridicules B for doing exactly what he, A, has repeatedly recommended, and says: " take it by ounces, three or more times " a day, and then you will observe what I told you." B, however, in so doing, is still unsuccessful; A now prescribes again what he did at first, or a quantity of many thousand million times less; every one witnessing such a transaction would say, with the greatest propriety, that A must be either a fool or an imposter; but according to the moral and intellectual conceptions of the fanatic homœopathists, A must be considered as " the strict and conscientious " man, the earnest inquirer after truth, and the profound observer." (Dr. Hering, l. c. p. 14)!—In leaving Hahnemann's doses of drugs, until we have arrived at the third maxim of homœopathia, we refer at present to the experiments on healthy persons with *large* doses of drugs, since, being forced to take one of both opposite extremes, equally recommended by him, we consistently take that one which he has constantly used, until he had in his experiments lately resolved otherwise. We take this course also in favor of homœopathia itself, because if the same dose of any substance or drug should operate exactly the same in health and in a diseased state, it would follow among other reasons to be mentioned, that the substance or drug must be quite indifferent.

This point of view adopted, we shall find, however, palpable contradictions, which, Hahnemann as well as his adherents, try in vain to veil by the tinsel of a borrowed scietific language. Dr.

Hering says, in this spirit, (l. c. page 14:) "medicines do not "become salutary by their direct effects, such as are manifested in "experiments on healthy subjects after strong and frequent doses, "but they are salutary by reason of their after-operation, or rather "of the counteraction of the organization."

We should almost conclude from these suggestions, that the injury of drugs, used in a manner not sanctioned by the tenets of homœopathia, depends upon their not causing any counter-or-after-action in the living organization. It appears impossible to comprehend how any substance could act otherwise on the living body than by counter-action, or by directing the irritability, sensibility, or whatever we may term the general or specific manifestation of the vital power to some primary action, from which, for a longer or a shorter time, a series of others, termed after-actions, results. It would indeed be quite a novelty in physiology to believe that medicines act on healthy persons only, "by their direct effect," and that the "counter-action" is only a prerogative of the diseased individual. It would also be difficult to comprehend, how any effect can be perceptible without counteraction, and if it were really possible, how the homœopathic experiments on healthy persons became manifest. If a substance does not produce counteraction in some way, then we can observe neither a beneficial nor a detrimental action; it is an absolute nonentity, from which no positive conclusion can be drawn. Without counteraction, the existence of all diseases would be only imaginary, since life itself could not exist; the direct action of all external influences, precluding all counteraction, being nothing but death itself. But admitting even that the suggestion quoted implies counteraction in the diseased and no counteraction in the healthy state, or a counteraction materially different in both; this itself involves so great a difference between the healthy and diseased states as reasonably to preclude such inferences. Supposing even the statement in the "Concise View" to be correct, viz: that the immensely diluted drug acts *more mildly* and with less violence in the diseased state, notwithstanding its vastly multiplied developed power, a proposition yet inconsistent in itself, we would ask for the present only, if the counter action depends merely on the vital power, how can it be explained or proved, that their reaction is more energetic in the diseased than in the healthy state, and that the spreading of any re-or-counter-action, be it by association or antagonism of the different systems

and organs of the living body, always extends in the former more than in the latter? This may be the case in a few instances of hyperæsthesia, but certainly not in anæsthesia or paralysis, and in the former always only with regard to the extent, and not to the intensive energy of the vital reaction; it appears more consistent with reason and sound physiological principles, to say, that the increase of intensive vital energy precludes all disorders and diseases rather than promotes them. We are well aware that Hahnemann in his religious duplicity, utters also frequently, and almost in the same breath, the most blasphemous and pious suggestions, saying in many passages of his writings, and even in the preface to his Organon, what no man of common sense has ever ventured to pronounce, viz. that "the vital powers are the most helpless, "most undesigning, most stupid, generally unbeneficial and injurious, and only instinctive," although in some other sections of his Organon and other works, he graciously compliments nature by leaving her some insignificant share in his all-curing method. But believing in our humble devoutness, that the vital powers in organized bodies, which form only a part of the universal powers of nature, are the most accomplished, most energetic and most beneficial, and perfectly worthy of the infinite wisdom and mercy of their eternal and omnipotent Creator, we are forced to admit also, that if these powers were possibly less restricted, and therefore more intensively energetic in any diseased state than in a healthy one—a proposition contrary to common sense—they would of themselves be quite sufficient to remove all diseases in the quickest and safest manner, without any medical aid, which would then be entirely useless or rather detrimental. The effect of substances commonly used by healthy persons, which the author of the "Concise View," calls in the sense of homœopathia, (page 26,) "endowed with peculiarly active properties, as well as medicines "properly so called, &c., such as coffee, tobacco, saffron, all spirituous drinks," proves also the inconsistency of the assertion, that medicines do not produce in healthy persons a counter-or after-operation, since this must be true also respecting the named substances; which, of course, would be absurd. To say nothing of the effect, palpable to every body, if a glass of madeira be given to a healthy infant, will it not produce a very serious counteraction, by which a series of after-actions will begin and continue, terminating probably in apoplexy, unless proper aid be quickly administered?

The same will be the case with a strong dose of any sufficiently powerful drug, when taken by a healthy adult. Dr. Hering admits the baneful influence of spirituous liquors when used habitually. Does not this prove the protracted counter-and after-operation of substances termed by him medicinal, if applied to the healthy body? How could the repeated abuse of brandy become so excessively detrimental to the physical and mental condition of man, if its effects were only immediate and not protracted by any counter-or after-operation, and herefore immediately extinct after it is taken? Is habit any thing but the gradually diminished and shortened counter-and after-action consecutory to a certain and sufficiently repeated external influence upon the living body? A person who gives himself up to drunkenness, this horrible and worse than brutal passion, begins by satisfying his taste with a small quantity, but he is compelled to increase it gradually, not as some recent authors assert, simply from a morbid irritability of the stomach or a distemper of its nerves, but mostly rather from the contrary cause, viz. from the physical insensibility of the nervous system, or from his reckless inclination to blunt, by this destructive stimulus, the moral feelings and thoughts on one side, and to animate the wrong ones on the other. Without the counter-action and after-operation of all the systems, particularly of the nervous system, and of its animal and spiritual head-quarters, such a wretched person would be obliged to drink incessantly, and even then would hardly attain his abject purpose.

The same remarks apply to all idiosyncrasies which, contrary to Hahnemann, are valued so highly by Dr. Hering, (l. c. page 25.) Hahnemann, in opposition to the daily experience of others, and also in contradiction to his own statement, on page 205 of his Organon, where he admits that all persons are not affected in the same manner by drugs, says explicitly on pages 197 and 198 of the same work: " by idiosyncrasy a proper condition of the " body is understood, in consequence of which there is in the same, " although considered healthy, an inclination to become more or " less morbidly affected by certain things, which produce no im- " pression or change in all other persons. But this defect of im- " pression in all persons is merely *imaginary*," and on pages 121 and 122, § 26, he says, " The physical and moral powers, which " are termed morbid influences, do not possess unconditionally 'the power of deranging health, but we only fall sick under

"their influence, when our organism is susceptible of the action of "morbific causes and becomes affected, changed, distempered, and "transmuted into abnormal sensations and actions by them;— "those powers therefore do not cause diseases in all men, nor in the "same man at all periods, &c.," and in § 27. "But the case is far "different with the artificial causes of diseases, termed drugs. In "fact, every real medicine acts at *any* time, under *all* circum- "stances, upon *every* living individual, and excites in him its "peculiar symptoms, (perceptible if the dose is large enough,) so "that it is evident that each living human organism must at "all times, and absolutely (*unconditionally*) become affected and "almost infected by the drug-disease, which as I have already "explained, is not the case with natural diseases."* The technical term, idiosyncrasy, may be explained more clearly by the disposition to become affected, by one or more certain agents, in a manner difficult to be subdued by habit, and unusual to the species to which an animal, or to the class to which a person belongs. It may depend upon the reaction of one or more systems, or merely of a single organ or part, and may be attributed to the peculiar structure or specific chemical relation of the system or organ affected, particularly of the nervous system, by which probably the vital electro-chemical (magnetical) process or that of vital attraction and repulsion, termed also (physical) sympathy and antipathy, is abnormally altered. Such an idiosyncrasy may exist with regard to common substances, as well as with unusual ones or drugs; not only

* The indulgent reader will on an attentive perusal consider the whole of this quotation, like most of the quotations from Hahnemann, as unintelligible and their single intelligible words and expressions as bombastic cant. We can however assure him, that they are not intentionally selected, and rather chosen by chance from similar ones to serve our objections; we have taken also the greatest pains to translate all these quotations faithfully, and have even frequently consulted the French translation of the Organon, to render them as intelligible as possible; but of course no faithful translator ought to substitute sense for the original nonsense, (as is frequently done in the incorrect French translation,) even if he were more partial or indulgent for the great mass of nonsense contained in the works of Hahnemann and his followers, than we pretend to be. Possessing only the 4th edition of Hahnemann's Organon, we are obliged to rely for some of our quotations on those older editions cited by Dr. Kopp, in his work already mentioned, who by his acknowledged respect and partiality for Hahnemann and his doctrines, will certainly have anxiously avoided all false quotations. Even where the sense of a quotation is too plain to be misunderstood, the fanatic homœopathists may charge us with an erroneous or false interpretation; these lines however, are not written for them, but for the benefit of the profession and the public, and we must leave such charges to be finally decided by the competent and impartial critic. Fortunately, our library affords us valuable means, to prove incontrovertibly the correctness of some of our assertions belonging to the history of homœopathia, and the biography of its author, which at least to our knowledge have hitherto been neglected by his opposers. We shall be much pleased to show these printed documents to every one who wishes to see them.

in health, but also in diseases; and this in such a manner that a person, possessed of a certain idiosyncrasy when in health, may lose it when sick, and vice versa; no one himself, and much less another person, can be aware of this peculiar disposition until he has observed it. Many of the healthy individuals on whom Hahnemann has made his experiments with drugs may have had such an idiosyncrasy, by which the result was varied without knowing it, and this must have led him to great mistakes in practice, although if all the individuals in question should have been quite free from such an idiosyncrasy, the homœopathist with all his "careful attention to minutiæ" will frequently meet with the same difficulties in patients possessing such an anomaly not known before. It would therefore at least be indispensable for homœopathists, unless they claim prophesy, to have minutely tried the effects of all their drug-atoms upon their patients, previous to their falling sick, and they ought not to employ any remedy with patients, who were strangers to them before. But this difficulty is not removed even by an intimate acquaintance with persons when in health, since, as stated above, it does not follow that the same particular disposition continues when sick.—It might justly be objected, that these difficulties are not peculiar to homœopathia, but affect also the allopathic treatment very much, and a judicious physician is well aware of the important influence of many idiosyncrasies upon a rational treatment. The difference however between these two is, that the homœopathist, infallible in his own opinion, will suppose, after he has ordered his patient to smell of a sugar-pellet every month or less frequently, that the increase of the disease is only the salutary counter-or after-action, produced by his magical sugar-pellet; and the patient must quietly endure this as the sign of his infallible cure, since, even if he becomes a great deal worse, this must be ascribed, in strict obedience to the dictates of Hahnemann, (see Organon, § 152,) to the beneficial effect of the drug, rather than to the influence of idiosyncrasy or to any other cause; whereas the allopathist, judiciously considering that no substance whatever acts absolutely and unconditionally, that many influences frequently alter the general effect of medicines, that some unexpected idiosyncrasy may prevail, &c., all of which are known to him by his experience or literary acquirements, will soon observe his mistake, and remedy it in time by another careful

selection, until he has overcome such extraordinary obstacles.* Exclusive of idiosyncrasy, the mind and body of the diseased individual, generally differs from what they were in a healthy state; all his feelings, thoughts and resolutions are more or less altered, so that physicians even, when sick themselves, are liable to many errors, and are therefore forced to call in the aid of a colleague. Pleasures to which we are accustomed when in health, such as the use of wine, coffee, segars, &c., generally grow disgusting to us when sick. This peculiarity extends even to those changes of the human body, which are established upon the fundamental laws of organized bodies, and which should therefore not be considered as diseased conditions; pregnancy, for instance, if even otherwise quite normal, frequently causes great changes in the physical actions of certain substances, so that healthy females in this situation are unable to bear, what in other situations affords them peculiar comfort; to say nothing of their singular and often irresistible propensities and other mental affections, frequently arising from want of a good education and from popular prejudices.

All experiments with drugs upon healthy persons must further appear very delusive, if we consider the constant influence of the mind and the nervous excitement generally attending such experiments. When a healthy or sick person is attentively ex-

* We were recently amused with a curious but true narrative, showing the obstinate and implicit faith of homœopathists in the tenets and dictates of their doctrine, which was told to us by a professional man, to whom the patient afterwards applied. In a large American city, a German merchant excessively enraptured with homœopathia, and forcing this "great treasure" upon his fellow-citizens by his constant obtrusive solicitations, induced a man, suffering from giddiness, to apply to his easy-and-quick-curing homœopathic doctor. As the patient grew daily worse after swallowing or smelling, we do not know exactly, a few atoms of some developed antipsoric "drug-virtue," he complained to the doctor, and was consoled with the assurance that this was the intended effect of the drug, being its "salutary counter-operation." After continuing the old, or some new developed drug-virtue for several weeks, the indisposition increased, the giddiness, which before intermitted for hours or days, became constant, and the patient, on going down stairs, fell, and was near breaking his neck. The patient remonstrated with the all-curing doctor, and on telling him that he had almost broken his neck, the doctor jumped up joyfully, and cheerfully laughing, exclaimed, "Oh! excellent! delightful! that is just the salutary after-"operation for which I so much wished! now you must believe yourself completely "cured!" The indignant patient, fearing a still more developed, similar after-operation, abandoned this frothy simpleton, applied to the allopathic physician mentioned above, and was soon cured of his giddiness by rational treatment.—This mode of saying to patients who feel no relief, or even feel worse, "you are mistaken, you "must not only feel much alleviated, but must now consider yourself completely "cured," is very common with homœopathic practitioners: it does not always arise from intentional imposition, or from this modern mode of quackery, but may frequently be ascribed only to the very characteristics of all honest fanatics, who, unconsciously blind to the light of truth, would make the whole world so, if they could, even by willingly sacrificing all that is dearest to them.

amining his own pulse, or the aperture of his own pupil, they often change from one moment to another, very remarkably, merely in consequence of the influence of the mind. Should the person be conscious of having taken a medicine for experiment, and of being watched attentively for its effects, he will undoubtedly present many symptoms which do not depend the least on the drug, but which are produced only by his mental excitement. This must be still more the case when he is already familiar with the expected symptoms, and therefore prepossessed, or even much interested in the result, by ambition, by scientific zeal, or by a similar cause. It is therefore not surprising that experiments, with the same drugs, minutely instituted on healthy persons, by others with less prejudice and with more caution against error, as for instance, those instituted by Professor Joerg at Leipzig, with his students, have led to results, which, though likewise totally at variance with all experience of their effect in diseases, are very different from those of Hahnemann, who anxious to multiply the morbid drug-symptoms produced by his experiments, has increased these symptoms to an enormous number: for instance, those of bark, which already amount to 1,143, (see Hahnemann's Reine Arzneymittellehre, or Materia Medica, Vol. III.,) and which will increase still more at pleasure, with the continuance of such delusive experiments.* Fortis imaginatio generat casum. Let one drop of water, coloured by any indifferent admixture, be administered to a person, especially if disposed to mental excitement, with the understanding that it is an active drug, which will produce numerous definite symptoms, all of which are to be minutely written down, by a close cross-examinator, and it is more than probable, that he will feel all the presumed effects and many more. How much prudent precaution must every circumspective physician take, not to be imposed on or misled by stories of his patients, mostly involuntarily arising only from their physical and mental excitements. Physicians, frequently prepossessed by a professional hobby, be it that they consider all diseases as inflammatory, venous,

* It appears that Hahnemann sometimes is duped in return by his disciples. We are at least told by a trustworthy young physician, now in this country, who after he had finished his studies in France and Germany, had lived for some months with Hahnemann, chiefly to become acquainted with his mode of treatment, that he was frequently induced by his fellow-students to follow their example, and make to Hahnemann fictitious statements about the drug-symptoms, after new trials with such drugs as he made them take. Hahnemann appeared confidently to believe the most absurd and ridiculous reports, and wrote them down with great satisfaction, probably for a new work, or for the next edition of one of his old "gigantic" works.

nervous, gastric, &c., or as arising from morbid affections of the heart, liver, &c., or from syphilis, itch, &c., must therefore be particularly cautious, not to elicit, by their cross-examinations, false statements from their patients.

In viewing theoretically these experiments with different drugs on healthy persons, in order to ascertain effects corresponding to the symptoms of different diseases, it would appear strange, and contrary to all former experiments, if they should ever lead to satisfactory results.

Health must be considered as that state in which the individual fulfils with intensive and extensive vital energy, its destination in respect to its natural species, to its age, and to the circumstances in which it lives, and must necessarily be accompanied by comfortable physical and mental feelings, as the natural consequences of the perfectly harmonious actions of all the integrant parts constituting the individual whole. Whenever this harmony is disturbed to such a degree that this destination cannot be performed, or that his feelings become uncomfortable, a more or less considerable diseased state exists. We may justly suppose the manifestation of all life, and of course also of both those states of organized beings in general, to be the product of two factors—one founded on the innate capacity to become affected by, and to react upon the agents external to the living body, and thus to preserve the particular characteristics of their individual life, (physical egotism, or subjective condition of life); the other originating from the action of the external agents themselves, (objective conditions of life) which instigate and entertain the action of the former, but are contemporaneously so restricted and modified by the same, that those agents lose, to a certain degree, their properties usually observable in physical nature, and also a part of those which may be considered as peculiar to the whole species to which the individual belongs. Thus caloric, electricity, poisons, &c. lose not only a part of their physical properties in all living bodies, but also peculiarly in every single individual, though often in so slight a degree that we cannot perceive it; facts which have made hitherto all exact definitions of the term poison impossible. All attempts to explain life in another manner might appear either inconsistent with our intellect and experience, or will contain the same sense expressed in different words; since thereby we can best explain the physical dualism prevalent in all the actions of nature, and its extinction

by commutation into a third, both uniting together, viz., absolute self-action of two opposite powers, and their mutual restriction, in order to form a third action resulting from them.—It follows, however, therefrom, that the healthy and diseased states are so far identical, that both are subject to the same general laws of organized living bodies, and that in both states the individual is equally liable to the loss of his life by agents absolutely destructive; but, nevertheless, the difference between both states is very prominent to a certain degree; for instance, poisons acting dynamically, are often used as antidotes with decided benefit in doses capable of destroying the life of the same individual when healthy; a fact which induced the intelligent Greek, with all the richness of his language, to use one and the same term for poisons and medicines. It naturally follows from the conditions of life in health and disease just mentioned, that nothing in the world can act unconditionally upon the living body, not even those agents which destroy life, since it is probable that, however unconditional the final fatal results of such deleterious agents may appear to us, they must nevertheless be regarded as a compound product of the agent itself, and of the state of the living body, at the moment the former acted. The same portion of a strong poison, for instance, does not kill all individuals equally quick, nor in exactly the same manner. We may allude not only to the differences in the decomposition of dead bodies varying in proportion to the absolute strength of the destructive agent; for instance, so far we know the equally quick decomposition of all animals killed by lightning, &c.; but, where the agent was in itself less destructive, and all the circumstances alike, the time and degree of the decomposition differ according to the difference of the vital energy which existed before death. Thus the fatal disease being precisely the same, the corpses of children are generally decomposed less quickly than those of adults, probably because the vital reproductive power being much more lively in them, it cannot be reduced, during life, so quickly as in adults, and because their mental capacities are less developed; as generally the action of the mind in adults exhausts the vital powers and hence the corpses of some lunatics also decompose less quickly. One and the same cause may therefore produce the most different diseases and their symptoms, according to the different states of the individual upon whom it operated. Every one will admit that to-day we escape unhurt from those agents which to-morrow may make us

dangerously ill. Intemperance in food and drink, cold, passions, &c., will occasion, in a number of persons, either none or the most different diseases, and of course also their different symptoms, and it is rare for one cause to produce uniformly the same disease. Hahnemann, well aware of these facts, acknowledged by common sense and daily experience, was forced to the greatest absurdity ever committed by man, in claiming for *his* drugs and for *his* experiments an *unconditional* operation. Had this not been the case, he would have indirectly admitted, that all his fortunate cures might be ascribed, not to his atoms, but to a strict diet, mental excitement, or other causes; he would have indirectly admitted, that a great many, if not all diseases, presenting, of course, different symptoms, might be cured altogether by one and the same drug, and that his whole materia medica might be reduced to a few, or even to one medicine. Thus, if he had admitted that table-salt and flint, as well as causticum and calcaria, did not act unconditionally, but that each of them, from different circumstances, might produce different symptoms in healthy persons, as he solely referred to their similarity in natural diseases, he might have substituted one of these four for each of the others, and thus, perhaps, also one for all his other drugs. The quackery of his whole doctrine would have been more evident, as he must then recommend for all diseases, on account of the frequent similarity of their symptoms, a panacea, or one universal remedy, which, being a simple drug, would have been credited by no one. He was forced, for these simple reasons, to contradict all experience and principles of the profession, and to reject even the smallest allopathic doses of drugs, being cunning enough to expect the unavoidable downfall of his whole doctrine at its first outset, even in the eyes of the most stupid, if, instead of his chimerical atoms of drugs, which are absolutely equal to nothing, the smallest allopathic doses were used; for instance, if, instead of the common remedies to check vomiting or diarrhœa, common doses of emetics and cathartics should be given in addition. We may predict therefore also with the greatest probability that, whenever homœopathists resolve to exchange their fanciful doses for common ones, as many do already secretly from hypocrisy, and as all of them will soon be forced to do, especially in urgent cases, their whole doctrine will cease to exist on account of its palpable injury.—It is one of the most satisfactory experiences in rational medicine, which alone may be considered

snfficient to destroy the whole homœopathic doctrine, and to outweigh all the suggestions of Hahnemann, that in some diseases, where the physiological and pathogenetical relations between cause and its effect are more clearly understood, and where, at the same time, the modus operandi of a drug is more fully ascertained, the drug loses its usual characteristic influence upon the body when in health, or when affected by a disease which either did not correspond from its beginning to the specific quality of the drug, or has ceased to do so in the successful progress of the treatment. Under such circumstances a drug may, therefore, be administered with the greatest benefit in doses a hundred times larger than the same individual would bear in his healthy state, until that disease is extinguished, when the drug immediately readopts its detrimental influence. This is the case, for instance, with mercury in syphilitic diseases, during which persons, who, when healthy, cannot take one grain without being salivated, may take it for a length of time without this effect, until the disease is cured. A similar effect of this remedy we observe also in all genuine inflammatory diseases of the mucous membranes, especially of the respiratory organs, such as croup, bronchitis, &c., in which the mercury appears only to operate against the disease itself, and to neutralize, almost chemically, its cause, viz., the increased plastic tendency of these membranes, without any material influence upon the salivary glands, until the disease begins to subside, when the mercury immediately reassumes its noxious effect. The same may be said of bark and its preparations in intermittent fevers, and in other periodical diseases. In such cases, if we should conclude, from the effect of the drug administered in health, upon its effect in disease, we should be very much mistaken. It is as inconsistent with reason and with sound pathogenetical conceptions of diseases generally, to suppose that drugs, administered to a healthy person, would ever produce such symptoms of diseases, and much less that the latter themselves resemble or correspond to those which are termed natural diseases, as it would be to believe the same definite product arising from two factors would continue to be the same, if one factor is changed, or both disproportionally. Let Hahnemann administer his drugs to healthy persons by ounces or by atoms; by what other arguments than his deceitful experiments can he prove that the ounces or atoms of his drugs contain, *qualitate* as well as *quantitate*, the same morbific agents as the atmosphere, the soil, &c. offer? Admitted even

the foolish supposition of a qualitative identity or similarity, must we not adopt the still greater absurdity, that his ounces or atoms are far more powerful than all natural agents, miasmata, contagia, &c. since, with the most noxious influences of the latter, during the prevalence of the most fatal epidemics, thousands escape, but from his drug-diseases, as he asserts, not one individual can escape, because they always act absolutely and unconditionally? Although this will be explained more fully in discussing the second maxim of the homœopathic doctrine, we mention here only, that as all life is to be considered as a definite product of the two factors, varying within certain limits in each individual at every moment, and in every state, but always under the supposition of the harmonious action of all the systems and organs when in health, it evidently results from our objections just mentioned, that the disturbance of this definite product or harmonious action by a drug, cannot admit of any sound conclusion upon the effect of the same drug, when the product is already altered by the change of one or both factors, or more briefly, when the body is sick. Who but an idiot can imagine, that two different products, the one presenting the healthy, the other the diseased state, could be changed by any third factor into two other products, which are either identical or diametrically opposite to one another; the latter must however be the case, when the same drug which makes the healthy sick, makes the sickly healthy.

For these palpable reasons, the conclusions respecting the action of a substance upon the diseased state from its action in health, must lead to the grossest mistakes; just as if we were to conclude, from the beneficial influence of the bright day-light on healthy eyes, that it must be also beneficial in those diseases in which photophobia is the prominent symptom, and in which the patient must be anxiously shielded from the light until he is cured by proper remedies, and even then must be gradually accustomed to bear it. The experiments with drugs on healthy persons may be considered in certain respects, though by far less scientific and more fanciful, similar to many physiological experiments on living animals, which also have sometimes led to very false conclusions, since tortured nature will present phenomena totally different from those where nature is left free and undisturbed; just as the pages of history, stained by the reports of tortured men, prove that this disgracefully barbarous manner of eliciting statements, has murd-

ered more innocent persons than it has brought guilty ones to punishment.

The first fundamental principle of homœopathia before us, if we dare call it so, is so intimately connected with the second, which may more properly deserve that term, viz: "similia similibus curantur," that we must now discuss them together. The objections already offered will appear to the impartial critic as sufficient, clearly to prove that, if the result of any experiment with a drug, upon a healthy individual, admits of no correct conclusion as to the salutary effect of the *same* drug when applied to *the same* individual, in its corresponding natural disease; all such experiments, instituted with a view to draw practical inferences, in respect to *all* individuals of one species when similarly affected, must a fortiori lead to the greatest errors and mistakes. Such experiments may be interesting for some physiological and pathological inquiries and may lead indirectly to valuable results, by the detection of specific medicinal properties contained in substances, if they are instituted with a minute knowledge of theoretical and practical medicine, and with an unprejudiced mind. The profession would be thankfully indebted to Hahnemann, for some discoveries ascribed to him, if he had acted in this manner; but in our opinion, even if his suggestions and statements in regard to his drug-sickness were as true, as most of them are false, a safe leading principle for medical practice never can or will be drawn from them.

The second maxim of Hahnemann's doctrine constitutes homœopathia itself: it asserts by "similia similibus curantur," that all diseases will be most safely and quickly cured, by minutely regarding the symptoms only, which are presented to the close observer in each natural disease, and that such simple drugs only, which produce in healthy persons symptoms most similar to the symptoms of the natural disease in question, will also be not only the proper but the only medicines for a direct or safe cure. Thus for instance, calomel if taken by a healthy person will generally produce salivation, and if continued long enough, ulcers on the gums, in the throat, &c.; homœopathia therefore considers calomel as the best remedy where such symptoms are observed; opium produces in healthy persons drowsiness, stupor, costiveness, &c., it must therefore be considered as the best remedy for the cure of diseases marked by drowsiness, stupor, costiveness, &c. Hahnemann, well aware that these assertions could not for a moment be supported

by experiments made with common doses of medicines, because calomel taken for salivation, or opium forcostiveness, in allopathic doses, would soon, and not excepting one among many thousands, increase the symptoms and all the dangers of the disease, was therefore, as stated above, forced into the other absurdity, that these and all other homœopathic drugs are to be applied only in doses which cannot be rendered too small by the process of dilutions or triturations. The latter forming, however, the third proposition or maxim of homœopathia, we shall discuss it hereafter.

The medical profession was before Hahnemann's doctrine, and is as yet, generally divided into the following three principal classes, not to mention their numerous subdivisions: The first class, or the mere theorists, explain the nature and proximate causes of diseases not arising from external mechanical injury, by general principles drawn from their knowledge of the universal physical powers of nature, from the various changes and modifications produced by the different structure and functions of organized living bodies in general, and particularly by the human body, from anatomy, physiology, psychology, &c. They are more in favor of general hypothetical causes and of some medical system, than of experience. In their pathogeny and therapeutics they refer particularly to the different external influences to which the patient was exposed before he fell sick, to the general symptoms which the three systems of the human body, the nervous, the vascular and reproductive present, to the chemical qualities of drugs, &c., and not to special symptoms and to the mere empirical adhibition of medicines. They are generally men of distinguished learning and talent, to whom the theory of medicine owes great improvements, but they are not practical men; being, by their too lively and too predominant imaginations, less able to institute minute observations, and to act with sufficient impartiality and circumspection than to speculate They are the poets, or at least *les beaux esprits* of the profession.

The second class, or the mere empirics, despise generally all theoretical sciences and reasoning. Without reference to causes, they regard only the symptoms of diseases offered to them by the palpable functional disorders in the systems, organs and parts of the human body, and the medicines recommended as the best specifics for removing the symptoms. Considering all physiological and pathogenetical researches as nugatory and useless, they rely principally on the prescriptions contained in the text-books on

materia medica and therapeutics, or on other practical statements. If they, from professional consciousness or from scientific interest, are not satisfied with the practical knowledge acquired as students, or by their own experience, but are eager and susceptible of modern discoveries, then they are much more fascinated by a new symptom, and new definite mode of treating a disease, or still more by a new medicine recommended as a specific, than by the greatest discoveries in physiology and the acutest elucidations in pathogeny and general therapeutics. Mostly from want of a thorough professional education, prepossessed with implicit self-confidence and very liberal in their prognosis, and in their promises of quick and safe cures, they generally enjoy the confidence of the public; though in fact, they are the *common labourers* of the profession. Without being in favour or conscious of any general principle, their treatment regards particularly the maxim, "contraria contrariis curantur," or that the diseases are to be treated by such medicines as are known to operate contrary to the symptoms; for instance if a person is costive, they prescribe cathartics; if the pulse of the patient is full, hard, quick, frequent, and the feverish excitement predominates, they bleed, leech, &c., even if these symptoms originate in opposite causes; or also, they attempt to substitute for the existing disease, one of minor importance, and they do this likewise without any judicious reason, and merely from their own experience, or from statements contained in books; thus they prescribe powerful cathartics, leeches, blisters, or similar revulsives, to generate a hæmorrhoidal flux, or to cause an artificial exanthema, when the brain or the lungs appear seriously affected, &c., whether or not this course is indicated by a circumspective reference to the true cause, and to particular important circumstances. Hahnemann in his classification calls the latter, more properly, allopathists, and the former of this second class, antipathists, from "αντι opposite, and παθος disease," or also enantiopathists, from "εναντιος contrary," but as both of these belong to our second class, and do not act similar to, (ὅμοίος) but different from (ἀλλοῖος) the symptoms of the disease, they may both be, and are now generally embraced under the term allopathists, or more correctly allœopathists.

Hahnemann and his followers give the latter name to all those physicians who are not in favour of homœopathia, and therefore, of course, particularly to those belonging to the *third class*, who endeavour to combine the principles and maxims

of theoretical medicine with the results of faithful observation and experience. Whenever it appears to their judgment, formed by a minute knowledge of all professional and collateral sciences and by their philosophical investigation, that a definite cause of the disease may justly be supposed, they do not reflect much upon the symptoms, but endeavour to remove the cause; but where the existence of such a cause cannot be explained by physiological reasons, they follow the directions which a sound diagnosis, based on the results of post mortem examinations, on a minute symptomatology, &c. assign to them, in accordance with the many faithful experiences on record. They value general pathogenetical and therapeutical principles more than naked experience, though in regard to the exclusive general modes of treatment, partially propounded in the so called medical systems, they are sceptics or rather eclectics, convinced that no medical system has stood or can stand the full test of impartial experience, although most of them contain, more or less, some valuable truths. They never loose sight of any thing which could, even distantly, benefit the profession, but nevertheless they are not influenced by any authority, and are anxious to remove even the delusive impressions of their own fortunate experiences, in order to individuate every case minutely and without the least preconception. They are the true artists of the profession and deserve the name of *physicians*, in preference to all the others; though being, from their want of implicit self-confidence, and from their contempt of even a refined charlatanism, cautious in their prognosis, and incapable of making definite promises of cure, they are seldom deservedly esteemed by the majority of the public, and enjoy merely the respect and confidence of its well educated and enlightened minority.

Hahnemann, as a homœopathist, belongs, if to any, most properly to the lowest rank of the second class, or to the rude empirics, notwithstanding all the abortive exertions of his followers to elevate his doctrine to the highest order of rational medicine, and to reflect on themselves all the great respect, admiration and gratitude which they believe due to him as the eminent reformer in medicine, and as the greatest benefactor of mankind. The principal difference between Hahnemann and the empirical allopathists consists in his maxim, "*similia similibus curantur* being the reverse of "theirs, *contraria contrariis curantur*." Both of them, but Hahnemann particularly, are opposed to all reasoning about the causes

of diseases, which they consider not only useless but absurd, believing that we know nothing about the causes and are therefore not authorized to form any conjecture or opinion from them.

As Dr. Hering's "Concise View" is very defective with regard to Hahnemann's exposition of the theory of homœopathia, we are obliged, respecting this subject, to refer more particularly to Hahnemann's Organon, and to the different introductory treatises of his large work, entitled, "*Reine Arzneymittellehre*," or *Pure Materia Medica*, because its six volumes do not contain, like all works on materia medica hitherto known, the physical and medical properties of drugs and their application in different diseases, but merely the results of his experiments on healthy persons with about *sixty* simple drugs, many of which are either long since considered by the profession as obsolete, or were introduced by him. It is almost impossible to follow exactly the track of his intellect, if it may be called so, on account of the total want of any logical order and consistency, and the many retractions and contradictions which we meet with in all his writings.

Hahnemann himself, by giving to his homœopathic doctrine the sublime name of "nature's law," says, (Organon § § 23 et seq.,) that he is quite indifferent as to any scientific explanation. The very name "homœopathia" and still more his explicit maxim, "similia similibus curantur," suppose however something like a theory; and we shall prove by the following extract from his remarks upon the infallibility of his "new art of healing," that he has some theoretical explanations in view, which, in the eyes of his adherents, are considered as highly scientific and acute.

Hahnemann suggests, in different places of his works, and particularly in his Organon, the following theory of his homœopathic pathogeny and therapeutics. The vital powers of the human body become, by some accident generally unknown, affected with a natural disease; upon this affection, the vital powers react automatically, either with a force too little and insufficient to remove the disease, or in such a clumsy, violent, and noxious manner, like the treatment of all allopathic physicians, that the patient must either succumb and die, or must bear sufferings, which, taking the place of the first affection, are generally worse than the original disease. Nature, unaided by homœopathic remedies, can seldom effect a cure, and much less can a cure be performed by an allopathic treatment, which, in hundreds of cases, may fortunately

cure only one patient. As every disease is only a dynamical distemper of the vital powers, manifesting itself by sensations and actions, and therefore discoverable only by our senses; and again, as this corresponds to the symptoms which are caused by the use of drugs in healthy persons; the disease cannot only be cured by this drug, but the latter, administered in a dose, however small, or in any degree of dilution, is always stronger, or more powerful in its action, than the natural disease, and thus the drug always possesses more power than is necessary to extinguish the disease. Although the original disease is destroyed by this extinction at all events, still a certain quantity of a slight drug-sickness always remains, which may now be left for its total extinction to the vital power; this secures for the patient a safe, quick and durable recovery.

If we were allowed the comparison, in regard to a subject which, according to some passages in Hahnemann's work, must be considered as immaterial, we should say that the surplus quantity of the drug-sickness always left, after it had extinguished the natural disease, appears similar to the margin of a spot overreaching by its greater size the spot extinguished or covered; we know no better expression, since he himself always uses the term "extinguish." We conclude from this suggestion of Hahnemann, which occurs frequently in his writings and in those of his adherents, that drugs do not act by their matter but by the infinite power or virtue developed from them; that this power must always be considered paramount to the power of the disease, and that it is impossible to give too small a dose of any drug, since the margin left by the covering drug could easily be too large to be extinguished by the impotent vital power, without which a recovery appears to him impossible.

This abstract of Hahnemann's doctrine presents one of the innumerable inconsistencies with which all his writings abound, and which cannot be explained, even by admitting the maxim itself to be correct and his explanations to be intelligible. In § 45 of his Organon he says, "Great nature herself has for homœopathic instruments to "cure diseases, as we have seen, the following stationary miasmata, "viz.: itch, measles and the small-pox, which, as remedies, are "much more dangerous and terrible, than the disease to be cured "by them, (as small-pox or measles) or which (as the itch) re-"quire to be destroyed, after having performed their cure;" and in the next section § 46, he says, "But see what great advantage

" man has over rude nature's accidental events! How many thou-
" sands of homœopathic powers to generate diseases, are at man's
" disposal, to aid his fellow brethren by means of drugs which are
" spread over the whole creation! In them he possesses the power
" of making diseases, as various as the innumerable natural dis-
" eases, conceivable or not, to which he can afford homœopathic
" aid. They are morbid powers, the force of which is extinct
" after the cure, and which require no other mode to extinguish
" them in turn, like the itch. They are morbid influences, (drugs)
" which the physician can dilute and divide, until they reach the
" very frontier of infinity, and the dose of which he can diminish
" until they are only a little stronger than the similar natural
" disease to be cured by them, so that this unparalleled method
" requires no violent assault on the organism to cure an old chro-
" nic and obstinate disease, and the transition from a state of the
" greatest sufferings to one of perfect health, so much wished for,
" is easy, imperceptible, and, nevertheless, often expeditious."
Leaving out of view the palpable nonsense contained in these lines, and the rude conceptions which, by a tedious study we might possibly derive, that any thing could adhere to the living body, as a hat, a cloak, or coloured spot does to a wall, without affecting the vital powers so as to be, partly at least, a product of their own independent action; we may ask, why, according to these statements, cannot nature alone cure the bodily disease better, or at least just as well, without the interference of the homœopathic drug? If nature is as strong as the drug, then the application of the drug is unnecessary for the removal of the symptoms. If *nature* is stronger than the drug, then she will, if left to herself, a fortiori, and much easier than the latter, remove the whole disease at once, or a part of it immediately, and the remnant afterwards also; just as well, as Hahnemann states, she can remove the remnant surplus of the curing drug-sickness. If the *drug* is stronger than the " miserable and automatically acting vital powers," and the latter only strong enough to extinguish the surplus always left by the former, as Hahnemann unequivocally asserts on pp. 16 and 17 of his Organon; then we may ask, why he does not dilute or triturate his drugs still more, until it is sufficiently weak or mild, so as not to leave to the miserable vital powers any remnant to remove? He is then not obliged to trust to the automatically and clumsy acting vital powers such an important

task, because the infinitely developed drug-virtues at his disposal would always enable him to cure his patient in this manner much more quickly; for should the dilution be *too mild* to extinguish the symptoms and to remove the disease, he would always be at liberty, and we should think it more advisable, to apply again another dose of the developed drug-virtue, rather than to risk any interference of the allopathically and awkwardly acting vital powers. If Hahnemann considers this work too difficult for his virtues developed from drugs, it is palpable nonsense first to claim for the latter a power always absolute and unconditional, and to admit immediately afterwards, that this power is checked by such a trifling obstacle! How can it be reconciled with common sense, that the vital powers are too weak and insufficient to remove any natural disease or its symptoms, be they ever so trifling, without the aid of a homœopathic drug, and nevertheless are powerful enough to remove the remaining part of the drug-sickness which is left after the natural disease is extinguished! Can any one comprehend that a power should be capable of overcoming a large obstacle and, however, be incapable of removing at the same time a similar and comparatively much smaller one!—Omne majus continet in se minus.—Hahnemann despises the living powers of nature so much, that he thinks them unable, without the aid of his homœopathic drug-atoms to contribute any thing to the cure of disease, and yet thinks them energetic enough to remove the much stronger disease or symptoms, caused by administering drugs to healthy persons; the drug-sickness being, as he states, stronger than, though similar to, the natural one? Is this because the vital powers are to be considered unimpaired and more energetic in health, while in disease they are miserable and weak? Then it is difficult to explain the attack of any natural or drug-sickness in health otherwise than by a kind of surprise, a "*ruse de guerre*," of the natural or drug-sickness. In a healthy person there is, of course, no symptom to be extinguished, no spot to be covered, no disease to be cured; when a drug is administered, the morbid affection is the mere effect of the drug, or the pure unmixed drug-sickness; this being always stronger than the natural disease, we would ask: how can the vital powers remove from healthy persons the presumed stronger and absolutely acting power of the drug after its drug-sickness has become manifest, when they

cannot resist or remove any weaker natural disease, if surprised by it, without homœopathic aid? This becomes more evident by the following explanation: If we call V the vital power, D the power of the drug, and N the natural disease; D = N and D < V, would make N < V; N < D, according to Hahnemann's general proposition, makes, a fortiori, N < V; but his assertion N > V in a person attacked with a natural disease, and V > D in the same person when healthy and a drug is applied, would make, a fortiori, N > D, contrary to his proposition, or to his cure of N by D, which is palpable nonsense. What power removes in healthy persons the artificially generated drug-sickness? In what disease does it terminate? What benevolent miracle or spirit, of the many at the disposal of the great philosopher, does here rescue the miserable and wantonly "infected" professional martyr from his sufferings which, as we should think, must continue till he breathes no more, after such an experiment, if he is not released? Hahnemann, to be consistent, must here invoke a *deus ex machina*, or those unfortunate persons, whom he has bereaved of their precious health, by subjecting them to his baneful experiments, will not recover, until he applies another drug as an antidote, which generates another drug-sickness; but as the same, if not greater, difficulties arise from this also, by again extinguishing too little, he must again apply to a new antidote, and so again and again, ad infinitum, without ever attaining his desired end. But we find nothing of this mentioned in his experiments on his healthy disciples and others; they were, as it appears, all doing very well, after they had presented, for a short time, to their great master, the most remarkable mental and occasionally also, some physical symptoms of the artificially produced drug-sicknesses, though they were forced to swallow doses of drugs, sufficient to make the most healthy and stout person dangerously ill for months; as we shall soon see. On the contrary we find, page 213 of the Organon, the following singular suggestion: "Ex- "perience shows, that the organism of the individual trying the "drugs, becomes, by these repeated attacks upon his healthy "state, more adroit in repelling all artificial and natural morbid "nuisances, and grows more hardened against all injury by these "moderate self-experiments with drugs. His health will be less "exposed to any alteration, and, according to all experience, he "will get more robust." This also is a new and luminous idea, which this "great philosopher" teaches to the world, hitherto so

short-sighted and ignorant as to believe, that every attack upon health and every disease injure the constitution more or less, and that a person will always, in direct proportion to his immunity from previous diseases, be less subject to new attacks from morbid influences. But we see that persons are much more subject to a relapse of a natural disease, for instance, of intermittent fevers, coughs, &c., than if they had never before been affected by them; homœopathists, of course, will say that natural diseases are inflicted by the "clumsy and stupid" powers of nature, and have not undergone such a high refinement as "the crude articles" which, by homœopathic manipulations, lose all their original matter, "and are no "longer possessed of their prejudicial character," (see c. v. p. 14).—How great the hopes of longevity to be attained in this easy manner! Even the poor druggists, who will now soon be ruined men altogether, (see Dr. Hering's c. v. page 4), would have been saved by Samuel Hahnemann, if his doses of drugs were only a little less fanciful, since every one would, of course, be anxious to obtain long life and health so easily.

The opinion hitherto entertained by all men of common sense, viz: that the surest, safest and shortest way to remove any effect is to remove its cause, is much ridiculed and despised by Hahnemann and his followers; "Cessante causa, cessat etiam effectus" has hitherto been considered an axiom by all wise men.—"Felix qui "rerum potest cognoscere causas."(*Virg.*)—The "old philosopher" however, "who boldly penetrated into the mysteries of nature," has resolved otherwise, and explains the laws of nature as he understands them.—It is true that in order to substantiate fully the meaning of this axiom, we should *know* the cause. But in most cases we cannot, and we must confess that Providence in His infinite wisdom and mercy has not thought it beneficial for our happiness during our present existence, that we should know any thing certain about the first cause, and many of its subsequent effects, which appear to us only as causes, "non enim nos Deus ista scire sed "tantummodo uti voluti,"(*Cicero de Div.*)—To promote our knowledge and improve our intellect, we must therefore adopt in all sciences, not based on mathematical calculations, certain more or less definite hypotheses which temporally explain best the phenomena in view. Since mankind left the sad period of its infancy, men endowed with distinguished intellect and with an ardent zeal for truth, have been no longer satisfied with the mere sensual

observation of natural phenomena, but have been anxious to investigate their causes, in order to deduce therefrom general principles, so indispensable to the mental satisfaction and happiness of man, and to all pursuits of social life. They were soon convinced that the original causes were and would in most cases always remain hidden from them, and they were therefore forced to frame such hypothetical explanations of natural phenomena, as appeared to them best adapted to comprise all phenomena belonging to one class, and to deduce therefrom general fundamental principles for further investigations. They were well aware that future discoveries and inquiries might unveil their errors and annihilate their hypotheses and conjectures; but they were also convinced that the observation of naked facts, would not only confine their higher intellectual faculties too narrowly, but expose them also to more hazard, than if they attempted to find the outlet of the labyrinth, without the thread of Ariadne. Thus by accurately and impartially observing phenomena and conjecturing their causes, a definite theory or a systematical doctrine was gradually constructed; that is, the abstract idea of what is common to all the facts belonging collectively to one class of phenomena, and under what circumstances they always or usually happen. Had they acted otherwise, and had they merely encumbered their memory with innumerable single statements, their experience would have been useful only in cases exactly similar to, or rather identical with, those remembered by them; but such an accident might probably not happen during many centuries, to whatever class the fact in question belonged; and hence all their knowledge would be entirely useless in every new individual case, if they could not refer to general principles, and if they were forced to abstain from all hypotheses in regard to general causes. "Nemo enim alicujus rei "naturam in ipsa re feliciter perscrutatur; sed amplianda est "inquisitio ad magis communia." (*Bacon's Org.*)—The value of any hypothesis, with which even the practical departments of mathematical sciences cannot dispense, depends upon the similarity of the whole mass of facts on which the hypothesis is founded, and upon the consistency as well as the facility with which this hypothesis is applicable to similar new facts. All experiences in regard to a fact, though instituted with due precaution against delusions of our senses and against errors of judgment, logical conclusions, &c., when it does not agree with the hypothesis laid down, materi-

ally impairs or destroys its validity. In some cases some philosophers approve of one hypothesis, and others of another widely different; although both are derived from minute observations of the same natural phenomena, both are equally acute and practicable, and both equally stand even the test of mathematical calculations. This is the case, for instance, with the two hypotheses of light: that of emanation adopted by Newton, and that of vibration suggested by Euler, which has more advocates at present, in consequence of the new interesting discoveries made by the late Frauenhofer, by Brewster and others.—Men who adopt tenets, prescriptions or results of naked facts, either self-created and observed, or received with implicit faith from others, without admitting the value of minute and repeated impartial investigations, or of any rational theory or hypothesis about the possible causes, degrade themselves to the level of common labourers or of credulous fanatics.—We have already mentioned the delusions of inferences superficially drawn from facts, and that this is really the case in regard to Hahnemann's experiments with drugs on healthy persons. Had such a course as this been pursued with the investigations in natural sciences, from their origin to the present age, we should know but very little or nothing really interesting and useful in regard to the laws of nature, the great number of valuable facts notwithstanding.—Another proof of Hahnemann's total want of sound reflection, and of his blind adherence to rude empiricism is seen in his combating with so much passion the unmerited credit given to him by some of his indulgent opposers, who believed that he has followed some rational principle in adopting the identity of natural diseases and of those produced by his experiments on healthy persons. In the introductory discourse to the third volume of his Pure Materia Medica, he says, amongst other remarks of the same kind, under the head of "nota bene for my reviewers," the following: "Never was the homœopathic doctrine intended to cure any "disease by the *same* and *identical* potenz, by which it was gene-"rated,—this has been minutely explained to my foolish opposers, "already often enough, but as it appears in vain.—No! it cures "naturally, only by a medicine never accordant with the cause of "the disease; never by an *equal* potenz, but only by a medicine "capable of producing a *similar* diseased state (ὅμοιον πάθος.) Do "not these people know even how to distinguish *equal*, (one and the same), from *similar?* Are they altogether homœopathically

" sick by the same malady of idiotism ?"—Very true ! they deserve this compliment from the great genius, who appears *allopathically* sick of idiotism.—Had Hahnemann only asserted that according to repeated experiments, drugs applied to healthy persons cause certain morbid alterations, manifested by definite symptoms similar to those caused by unknown natural influences ; and that, therefore, as the former are removed by certain drugs, the latter will also be cured by the same ; as, for instance, that belladonna produces symptoms similar to those of scarlatina levigata, and that as the former are mitigated or removed by acids, mercury, or whatever the treatment may be, therefore the latter will be cured by the same remedies.*

* We believe that, if medical practice ever derives any advantage from fair trials with drugs on healthy persons, it will be this. And it appears remarkable that Hahnemann, and particularly his followers, have not distantly thought of this plain and reasonable meaning of the expression, " similia similibus curantur," which, if simply translated, signifies only, that diseases which are similar to each other will be cured by similar remedies. Rational medicine has hitherto, in some respects, followed a similar course in some diseases ; thus it pays no regard to the shape, colour, duration, extent, &c. of many chronic exanthematous diseases, which present so many varieties and shades ; but asks, whether it originates from a syphilitic, scrophulous or other infection ; and if none of these causes can be ascertained, such remedies are administered as prove generally useful in diseases of the reproductive system, attended by chronic cutaneous eruptions. So too the rational physician will prescribe the same remedies in very different blenorrhœas, as in phthisis pituitosa, chronic mucous diarrhœa, &c. ; convinced, by experience, of their salutary effect in one species, he will try them in similar ones, without any other recommendation, when no special cause is found to prevail ; since he will reasonably conjecture, from the anatomical structure, and the physiological functions of all the mucous membranes, that a remedy, which is useful in one species of blenorrhœa will be so in another, and that in this respect, gleet, chronic mucous bronchitis, the chronic affections of the large intestines consequent on cholera, &c., are similar. Hahnemann's interpretation of similia similibus curantur, would never have occurred to any intelligent man, and much less to an Albertus Haller. If this great man recommends trials with simple drugs on healthy persons, in saying, in the preface to the Pharmacopœia Helvetica, Basil, 1771, p. 12, " Nempe " primum in corpore sano medela tentanda est, sine peregrina ulla miscela," he did so with the same views as those which, mutatis mutandis, led him to institute so many cruel dissections of living animals ; well knowing that these could never be directly useful to the treatment of diseases, he made them for highly interesting physiological purposes, which have largely, though indirectly, contributed to promote practical medicine. He likewise recommended trials with simple drugs on healthy persons, certainly not in the sense of homœopathia, but merely because he thought, as does every judicious physician, that if made with care, they may contribute to show particular effects of many drugs, which may lead indirectly to some results valuable for the cure of diseases ; as many would try some newly discovered plant or other substance to learn whether it contains wholesome nourishment, or some medical property which may be successfully used in extraordinary cases, according to the principle contraria contrariis curantur, or to any other one : for instance, should such a substance, produce costiveness or increase the appetite in healthy persons ; it may also alleviate or cure a chronic diarrhœa or dyspepsia. The history of medicine proves that the healing art in its infancy has exclusively followed this mode. No one but a man partial for extraordinary absurdities would fancy, that the intimate connection between cause and effect, everywhere confirmed by the laws of the human intellect and of nature, would be suspended in man, justly considered as the culmination of nature ; and only an idiot will recommend a sound whipping with Urtica, (the stinging-nettle) for a feverish exanthematous disease, called febris urticata, (nettle-rash,) on account of its great similarity with the appearance of the skin of those who are whipped with the fresh plant mentioned!

His doctrine might not have essentially suffered by such a theory, but might have appeared to rest at least upon some rational connexion between cause and effect; and therefore, if otherwise not contradicted by minute and impartial experiments sufficiently repeated, would have appeared less absurd, and perhaps would have led to some valuable practical results. But what confidence can any one, not prepossessed by implicit faith in the dictates of others, place in a doctrine which teaches, contrary to common sense and experience, that the similarity between two cases shall form a leading principle for practice, so as to use the cause of one effect for destroying another effect, seemingly similar in its symptoms, but evidently produced by a totally different cause? We see nothing of this in nature. Two cubes, spheres, or bodies of any other shape, and which may consist of very different substances, cannot only be geometrically similar, but identical in all their dimensions; and nevertheless their reciprocal relations, or those toward a third body, may vary very much or be diametrically opposite; the one, for instance, may be of glass, and the other of gold. The isomorphical formations of many minerals, lately demonstrated by Professor Mitscherlich, at Berlin, prove that the principal characteristics obvious to our senses in these cases, as cohesion, colour, crystallization, &c. may be quite identical in two or more minerals, although chemical analysis proves them to be widely different from each other, in the absolute as well as relative condition and proportion of their integral parts. Nature presents to us, on the other side again, many isomerical substances, in which the chemical analysis can find, neither a qualitative nor a quantitative difference of their constituent parts, although their external characteristics are quite dissimilar. Who would, for instance, judge, from their external appearance, that a diamond and a piece of charcoal, or graphite, of the same size, are the same in the eyes of the modern analytical chemist; and who but a Newton could have predicted, from optical reasons, the combustibility of the diamond, almost a century before Lavoisier proved it by his experiments! Many plants, although very similar to each other, according to the natural and artificial systems of botany, differ widely in their action on the living animal body, and probably also in their constituent parts; as, for instance, the different species of Solanum. If therefore the laws of nature are more simple in minerals than in plants, in these more so than in the lower classes of ani-

mals, and so on gradually until we arrive at the most compound and perfect organization of man, whose existence depends partly on the immaterial world of ideas and feelings; and if, nevertheless, in the lowest of this series of bodies and beings, we meet with an external similarity not corresponding with the real causes of their true characteristics, by which the certainty of any conclusion, from their similarity upon their causal identity, could be justified beforehand: how much less probable must it be, a priori, that the similarity of symptoms, generally observable under very different conditions, in man, could admit of any satisfactory conclusion, as to the similarity or identity of their causes also? Such superficial and totally unphilosophical conclusions have always led, and will still lead, if admitted, to the most erroneous conceptions; which, in their practical application, must unavoidably impair our own happiness and that of our fellow-men. Thus we should soon witness the greatest injustice and foolish mistakes, if ever Lavater's physiognomical or Gall's cranioscopical observations, should in the least influence our manner of educating, or our criminal jurisprudence, because they rest on true and highly interesting facts, which however have likewise led to very unphilosophical conclusions.

The symptomatical treatment of diseases has therefore always been considered by the enlightened profession as very delusive and uncertain, since different causes may present the same symptoms, and vice versa; hence it is still adopted principally by the uneducated and rude empirics, and is used by talented physicians only in urgent cases, where the previous conditions and influences cannot be minutely ascertained, and where the causes of alarming symptoms being unknown, dependance must be placed on the majority of experiences on record, in which definite prescriptions were successfully applied under certain prevailing symptoms. This mode is seldom considered by rational physicians as affording more than a temporary relief; since frequently by removing the symptoms, the disease itself is increased by increasing its cause, and by producing all the great injuries of an indirect treatment. We may justly assert that the mere symptomatic treatment has hitherto arrested the progress of the healing art, and has frequently elevated the less talented and less learned physician over his better educated and conscientious colleague in the eyes of the public, as they from pardonable ignorance rely more on the immediate and palliative temporary relief than on the less showy but preventive and radical

treatment of true rational medicine. Thus for instance, in sleeplessness and delirium, caused by genuine inflammatory cerebral irritation, opium will perhaps subdue these prominent and also alarming symptoms; but unquestionably either the disease itself will increase to a fatal issue after a short relief, or it will cause, particularly in children, water in the brain, or a chronic and incurable nervous debility, which is often observed after a seeming recovery has lasted for weeks or months. Hence a judicious physician will seldom prescribe such remedies as are only calculated to subdue a prominent symptom, in cases where there is any hope of a rational treatment, although the palliative method is often desired by the patient or his relatives, from prejudices originating in the rude empiricism of many doctors. We may with propriety compare such treatment to that of many intellectual and moral faults, where concessions made from temporary necessity or other minor reasons, are also only of temporary avail, and rather promote the commission of greater wrongs, though the latter would be best prevented by a cure perhaps more protracted, but radical in rendering the individual sensible of his wrong. Empirics unable to conjecture the causes of the symptoms, adhere generally to those which they have learned by heart, and if they accidentally meet with symptoms which they do not remember, or which are not contained in their text-books, they are at a loss how to begin with the patient. To this search for symptoms, which must not be confounded with the indispensable study of rational diagnosis, we owe principally the anxious desire of the profession to enlarge the yet superabundant stock of medicines, since if an empiric accidentally succeeds in removing a symptom already known, or recently discovered by him, he at once obtrudes a new remedy on the profession, with all the emphasis of a highly important discovery; this however is soon forgotten, as it generally fails in cases seemingly identical.

The mere symptomatic or indirect treatment of diseases is the cause of all quackery in medicine, as a certain simple or compound drug is generally recommended from ingorance or low interest, for a certain number of symptoms termed collectively by some technical name. And by this also the multitude of our voluminous works on materia medica and special therapeutics with all their minuteness and with their shining splendour of extensive learning, very few excepted, have hitherto retained, only upon a larger scale, all the irrational and motley features of similar

older works, which led the mere empiric to do more evil than good to the mass of his patients.—We are well aware that the symptomatic treatment of the homœopathic doctrine is very different from the one hitherto so termed, since it pretends always to rest not only on one or more symptoms, but on their minute similarity with the symptoms of the drug-sickness, and pays no regard to the name of the disease. Hahnemann's general objections against the nomenclature of diseases, in many parts of his works, are to some extent correct, as no individual case of any disease will resemble exactly the minute description of it, as given in any catalogue or system of nosology; but he is very wrong in asserting that in this the great mistakes of allopathic medicine principally consist, and his anxious warnings to his disciples (see Organon §75) never to use the customary language of the older schools, in regard to distinct names, but always to say, "a kind of dropsy, a kind of typhus fever, &c." are exceedingly puerile and ridiculous. The descriptions contained in nosological systems, are the abstracts of many close observations, made by the profession for centuries, and, if correct, are to be considered similar to the ideal of the artist, which is likewise the abstract of many individualities, seldom or never exactly occurring in one person. Both are very valuable, although the physician in a special case, as well as the artist who wishes to obtain a true likeness, would never gain the desired end, without minutely referring to the individual case. It would be impossible for any systematical nosologist to describe the genera, species and the innumerable varieties of diseases, on account of the multifarious combinations of the symptoms. The plan hitherto followed by them was intended simply to teach this branch of practical medicine systematically; their works are only glossaries of the profession, by which physicians can speak of its objects in intelligible and brief terms. No judicious physician will consider the case before him only with regard to the name given in his nosological text-book, whether the description of it, there presented, be similar to the case or not; he will always recur to the principles of physiology, general pathology and therapeutics, the only true and safe resources of all rational treatment:* he will use the

* We candidly confess, that among thousands of patients entrusted to our care, we have seldom been able to name a disease, distinctly corresponding to any nosology or to its popular name, though patients and their relatives are frequently more anxious about the name of the disease than about the cure, and the relatives are often better satisfied with that physician, whose patient died, provided he had given to the disease a name, than with him, whose patient recovered, but who had not named the disease;

shortest and most suitable terms, merely to avoid the tedious and useless minute description, belonging to monographies or to accurate accounts of interesting and complicated rare cases. The contempt of all nosological terminology by Hahnemann and his adherents evidently does not promote medical knowledge in the least; it checks the progress of the profession by increasing the difficulties of scientific discussion, and it makes, of course, no difference, if a mistake be made in the diagnosis of an individual case, whether a name may have been given to it or not. The great evils which always arise from the abuse of nosological systems may be regarded as additional proofs, how little advantage can be derived from symptoms, and that the reliance upon the causes or upon a judicious ætiology, derived from a minute anamnesis, offer by far the surest aid to medical practice. It is also true, that the inconveniencies mentioned, arising from the mere reliance on symptoms, are not peculiar to the homœopathic maxim, "similia similibus curantur," but almost in the same degree also to the opposite maxim, "contraria contrariis curantur," since both refer only to the relation between symptoms and their appropriate medicines, both avoid all close rational investigation into the causes of the diseased state, and both neglect the truth, that in the narrow compass of our senses, one and the same cause, acting in different diseases, may produce different symptoms, and one and the same symptom may arise from different causes. If, therefore,

doctors are, therefore, from prudence, seldom at a loss to give a name.—Indeed, it seems very remarkable to a physician, who has studied men during his long practical career, how utterly ignorant laymen in general are in regard to medicine, although most of them, who would not interfere with the business of the lowest mechanic, profess to know minutely what belongs to the healing art: they will not be satisfied unless they see signs and wonders elicited by the bold treatment of the doctor. Should the doctor not prescribe large bleedings, powerful emetics, cathartics, leeches, epispastics, blisters, and similar remedies, the effects of which are palpable, they would question his talents more, even if the patient recovered, than they would if he died, after every remedy which they knew had been prescribed. In what order the doctor was pleased to employ the whole apparatus of his art, is of less or no consequence, although none of them would be contented with the builder, who would apologise for his ignorance, in putting at the top of the building what belongs to the foundation, and vice versa, by pointing out among its ruins, all the integral parts of a durable edifice. Thousands of human lives would be preserved annually, and many be spared the sufferings arising from bad treatment, if the public would abstain from all interference with an art, for which the life and assiduous study of many centuries would be too short, and if, after becoming acquainted with the vast extent of the healing art, and with the many requisites of its true and faithful servants, they would rather amply provide for and insist upon a thoroughly classical and professional education and upon rigorous public examinations of their physicians, before these are intrusted with the lives and health of so many. Then also, but only then, the profession would be elevated to that dignity and enjoy that respect which it so justly deserves, and then would it be no more necessary to combat such a superstitious doctrine as homœopathia, because like all rude empiricism and quackery, it could not exist for one day.

the latter or the maxim termed, "antipathic," or " enanthiopathic," by Hahnemann, is declared false by him, it follows from this point of view, that the homœopathic maxim is so likewise. Abstracted from further objections, which we shall endeavour to explain on arriving at the third maxim of homœopathia, the antipathic maxim might easily be proved to be far more consistent with the general laws of nature and the human intellect particularly, although it is evident that, from its nature, its relative greater correctness cannot be ascertained by the tests of experiments on healthy persons. The medical literature of every century, since the beginning of the healing art, abounds in cases in favour of the maxim, contraria contrariis curantur; how few in comparison with these are the instances quoted by Hahnemann in favour of his doctrine, from the same sources, which, even if his quotations were correct, would not be in his favor, and much less now after he has altered and distorted them. Who, inclined to trust on such important subjects, merely to the majority and validity of authorities, would therefore hesitate for a moment to prefer the antipathic maxim? If Hahnemann was even guilty of being consistent, every one would allow that he has imprudently furnished to his opposers the strongest weapons against himself, by quoting instances of cures, from the oldest records of the profession down to the present century: not only because he asserts *that the true healing art has not existed before him*, (see Organon, preface) but also because these cases prove at a glance, that *not one was ever treated in his manner*, if we only reflect on *his* and *their doses* of drugs, may one or the other or both be considered, comparatively, immensely large or small. Who, but an idiot, would consider it an argument, that the power of the many billionth part of one grain must prove immensely great, because a drachm of the same substance has sometimes shown some similar but much smaller effects, or vice versa? It would appear, at least, much more prudent for him, to take no notice of such records, which are otherwise so useless in his eyes, and to let homœopathia rest on its own intrinsic worth, if he did not intend to influence the weak-minded by learned quotations.

Hahnemann's singular conceptions of the manner in which homœopathic drugs act, is so intimately connected with his maxim about the doses of his simple drugs and their developed virtues, that we should be more guilty of repetitions than we are already, in consequence of his multiplied contradictions, if we did

not leave a part of this discussion also, until we have arived at the third maxim of homœopathia, which comprises all its maxims together. We feel, however, obliged to add a few pertinent remarks about the maxim, similia similibus curantur, to vindicate our assertion, that the maxim opposite to his, corresponds still more to the laws of nature and to the human understanding. Hahnemann, justly opposed to all corpuscular action of drugs in the cure of diseases, says, in his introduction to the second volume of his Materia Medica, on page 13, under the head of "Spirit of the Homœopathic Doctrine:"—"But it is evident, that "medicines, acting in a *heterogeneous* or *allopathic* manner, with "the intention to produce other symptoms in a healthy person, "than those of the disease to be cured, cannot, according to the "" nature of the subject, be either suitable or salutary, but must "act in an oblique direction; otherwise every disease would be "cured quickly, safely, and durably, by any medicine ever so dif- "ferent, which would form a direct contradiction (contradictionem "in adjecto), because every drug possesses an action different from "all others, and every disease generates, by the eternal laws of "nature, a distemper deviating from other similar ones, and this "would involve the impossibility of a good success, since every "change can only be produced by its appropriate cause, and not "per quamlibet causam. And thus it is also confirmed by daily "experience, that the vulgar medical practice of prescribing "in diseases motley recipes of unknown medicines, produces se- "veral effects, but, least of all, cure."—Let him, who can, understand this gallimatia; although faithfully translated, we confess we cannot!—The only sound inference which may be drawn from this explanation, as well as from the above mentioned mode, in which we are told that the homœopathic drug extinguishes the symptoms of the disease, and by this the latter itself, is, that Hahnemann considering in other places his virtues developed from drugs as acting like infinite beings, spirits, &c., alludes here to the grossest mechanical notions. It is impossible to comprehend why, if his propositions were not correct, it must follow that a drug "must act in an *oblique* manner," and why otherwise "every "disease would be quickly, safely and durably cured?" It would appear to follow therefrom, that he admits, contrary to his whole doctrine, that two directions are left for the cure of all diseases, viz., one from before, and another from behind. In following

this ridiculous explanations of Hahnemann, we should think it evident that as any mechanical power, which counteracts another, can act neither in a direction parallel to the first, nor in the same direction behind it, but either in an opposite or in an oblique direction, these last will check the original power according to their *relative degrees;* the oblique, however, according to the power resulting from the two originally counteracting powers, in consequence of the known physical law of the diagonal direction in the parallellogram of two forces.

Hahnemann extending his reform, or rather his creation of the genuine healing art most graciously, not only to the whole class of diseases called *bodily*, but also to those called *mental*, and alluding to the latter in many places of his works says, (see Materia Medica, Vol. II., page 23,) "... in the same manner the melancholy "girl would, in her solitude, afterwards be sunk in still deeper "affliction, about the death of her friend, if she should have been "enlivened for a few hours, only *palliatively*, by a gay party, "because this influence was only *contrary, enantiopathic.*" According to this old philosopher, "who boldly penetrates still deeper "in the mysteries of nature," (see Dr. Hering, l. c. p. 13,) we have to look also for a great reform in the treatment of all mental affections, and consistent with his wise inference just quoted and selected from similar ones, it would not for instance, be advisable to console a sorrowful and deeply afflicted lady, who had just suddenly lost her beloved husband, by telling her the glad tidings that her dear and only son, whom she had long considered as dead, had happily arrived. No! God forbid! to risk such an allopathic or rather antipathic mode which might kill her, as such remedies always do; better to invent, and to tell her some additional great misfortune; that will unquestionably console her more and dispel all danger of a mental derangement; it will make her feel quite happy and cheerful, because it is a homœopathicremedy, *a simile*, "O! sancte Apollo qui umbilicum terrarum obtines!"

In order to do summary justice to the homœopathic maxim, similia similibus curantur, and if possible to sustain its correctness, we shall advocate it for a few moments in the sense of its author, and admit that it may accord with the law of nature, that of causes and their effects, which are so intimately connected, that one cannot change without a simultaneous change of the other, and that therefore as the effects constitute the symptoms, an implicit

reliance on these symptoms is not only useful, but quite sufficient for medical treatment. It would be reasonable to suppose that the least changes of the causes must naturally produce corresponding changes of their effects. Hahnemann in support of this proposition of his doctrine, concerning the great value of symptoms in general, could have cited a great many natural phenomena, which confirm the abstract correctness of this proposition. From different instances of that kind, we may select from natural philosophy a modern interesting one, viz. the polarization of light, which has been so much improved by the ingenious and learned Brewster. It led to the presumption that there might still exist a difference, however small, in the proportion of the constituent parts of some substances, hitherto considered chemically alike; and indeed minute chemical analyses, instituted on account of the difference in the polarization of light, by these substances have confirmed it. But if we consider the immense multitude of organs and parts of the human body, each of which may present a symptom to the close observer, independent even of the mental functions, which we never shall be able to refer with any probability to single organs and parts; if we reflect on the immense number of symptoms which naturally arise by their various combinations, as depending on the primary and sympathetical affections of all these systems, organs and parts; could we discern minutely with our imperfect senses one single case in praxi? We answer, no; even if the age of Methusaleh were granted to the physician and his patient. The combined actions of all the parts of the living body, caused by the constant influence of external agents, both of which are continually varying, would preclude still more the correctness of all conclusions for the next moment, as the appearance of the disease may in all probability then be again totally altered from what it was a few moments before. No physician can isolate his patient and perform experiments upon him, as he would do if investigating a topic of natural philosophy, &c. The most ample experiments of this kind repeatedly instituted by the philosopher with the greatest care and accuracy, and aided by the numerous modern improvements in philosophical instruments, are frequently insufficient to protect him against errors and mistakes; how much less then can the physician who has to contend with so many and so great obstacles, rely with certainty on his experiments at the bedside of his patient, without such ample means at his disposal? With all the hare-brained nonsense

of Hahnemann, asserting that homœopathic drugs alone act *absolutely* and *unconditionally*, do not common sense and experience claim also for the immense multitude of agents in all surrounding nature, at least *a little more* to excite the same counter-and-after-actions which he claims for his infinite atoms? Are all men, independent of the differences in their features, stature, &c., formed so much alike, that we can rely with any certainty upon symptoms? Is there not something peculiar in the construction of the different organs, in their situation, &c., which though perhaps of no great influence during health, may produce in the diseased state, symptoms quite different from those established by the homœopathic symptomatology, if we even could admit its correctness? And as we never see two men with exactly the same features, and much less two whose lives are attended with similar incidents, may we not also, a priori, expect the same disease in one person to present very different symptoms from those in another; and that particularly in chronic diseases, many symptoms termed, from their predominance, *pathognomonical*, are often observed only where the local affection is so severe, that the cure is frequently almost beyond the control of the art? How different and delusive are the symptoms in the different organic and functional diseases of the heart, as stated by many most distinguished and trustworthy modern authors! Two great physicians, Burns and Abernethy, have observed in post mortem examinations the greatest abnormal formations in the heart, the one however mostly without the least, the other almost always with prominent, symptoms during life. Percussion of the chest, which was mentioned by Hippocrates, was again introduced and much improved for practical purposes about seventy years since, by Auenbrugger, a German, and was carried to great perfection, by combining immediate with mediate auscultation, by the great French physician, Laennec, and many of his distinguished countrymen, for the minute diagnosis of the different deformities and other morbid affections of the heart, the lungs and other parts. How much have the many symptoms elicited by all these valuable experiments, contributed to point out *with certainty* the real state of the body during life, or to improve the treatment of the corresponding diseases? Very little to the one and nothing to the other.*

* Notwithstanding these great improvements in the diagnosis of diseases of the chest, the number of deaths by pulmonary consumption increases in all the large

Moreover, it would alone require the close study of many years, a very sharp hearing, and an uncommonly good memory, in order to distinguish correctly, by the stethoscope, plessimeter, and similar modern implements, the different sounds of pectoriloquy, ægophony, garguoillement, etc. in the various diseases of the chest; and when, as is generally the case, two or more of these sounds are combined together, one shade of a sound might prevent the perception of the other, and by rendering the experiment illusive, leave the treatment as uncertain as it has been heretofore: nay, perhaps still more so, since, as we have sometimes witnessed, physicians, prejudiced by such a scrutiny, have considered cases as absolutely hopeless, which have afterwards been cured. Frequently these highly valuable modes of inquiry contribute only to the charlatanism of doctors, who, anxious to show by them that they are not behind modern discoveries, run about with their stethoscope, plessimeter, etc. under their arm, and apply them with a grave face, as if they could hear the grass grow by them; and then pronounce a fatal prognosis, with such an unconditional certainty and selfconfidence, as if they possessed the very means of weighing minutely the living powers of nature in their remotest recesses; and if the relatives of the patient trust their prophesy and follow their advice to use nothing but trifling domestic medicines and to despair, it will be also fulfilled.

How frequently is the practitioner misled by symptoms, considered as pathognomonical, in diseases of the abdomen; and meets, in post mortem examinations, with defects and deformities never anticipated during life.* The same is the case with the many diseases of the brain, an organ which our sensual age, so poor in elevated conceptions of true philosophy and poetry, and so rich in all

cities of Europe and America to an alarming extent. Thus, in New York, according to the public reports, the number of such cases has increased, within four years, from eighteen to upwards of thirty-six weekly; an increase of a hundred per cent.; whereas within the same period, the population has increased, at the most, only ten per cent. We predict that the ratio will increase still more, as all chronic diseases do, which depend on a syphilitic, scrophulous, tubercular, &c. infection, such as cancer, dothi enteritis, abdominal consumption, &c. Hundreds whose lives could have been saved, will fall victims to these diseases, and particularly to pulmonary consumption, if the faults in the physical and psychical education, the carelessness of the public and of the profession, in regard to its prevention and treatment, are not remedied; but above all, if the murderous mode of diffusing the spurious and contaminated cow-pox should continue.

* "Subtilitas naturæ subtilitatem sensus et intellectus multis partibus superat." (F. Bacon's Organon.) In post mortem examinations we have found both lungs very much diseased, in cases which presented no symptoms of pulmonary affection during life, and have read of instances where both kidneys were totally destroyed and changed into large bladders, filled also with sharp-angled calculi, and yet the urine was neither considerably suppressed nor much changed in character. (See Lebkuechner's Report, in Med. Correspondenz Bl. d. Wuertemb. Aerztl. Vereins, 1834, No. 7.)

the common-place results of a flat and prosaic materialism, tries minutely to connect with the functions of the human mind and its various morbid affections! Would those who, in our time, always merely rely on the palpable, ever have expected, from the symptoms obvious in lunatics, that, in some of them, no other deviation from the healthy state has been found, but a more or less perpendicular direction of the transverse colon; a part, as it appears, so little connected with the functions of the human brain. This remark was first made upwards of seventy years ago, by Pyl, a distinguished German author on legal medicine, and has recently been confirmed by the celebrated Esquirol. Many large and interesting volumes have been written, for almost half a century past, on the symptoms of the different states of the brain after external violence, in order to ascertain where trepanning is or is not indispensably required; and yet nearly the same uncertainty prevails with regard to the most contradictory statements of symptoms. We observe almost daily instances recorded in surgical periodicals, where trepanning proved fatal, after having been instituted according to the modern advice, never to neglect it in cases the least doubtful, whether the skull is much broken, depressed, etc., or not, and we know cases of depression, fractures,&c., much more desperate, which were cured without any surgical aid, merely by a long continued, rigorous antiphlogistic treatment.

If such obscurities in respect to symptoms still exist in regard to the principal organs of the human body, after all the minute observations, at the bedside as well as in post mortem examinations, how much less can we rely on symptoms relating to parts of less importance or of less intimate connection with the whole body; how much less can we rely on those symptoms which rest mostly upon feelings so exceedingly illusive, and still less if they are founded upon novel observations, avowedly made for by far too short a time for any positive result in such subjects, and reported by a man so little trustworthy as Hahnemann has proved himself to be? Do we further not sometimes observe very remarkable deviations in nations almost adjacent to each other, which although of no material importance for rational medicine, would however be important in regard to the strictness seemingly required by the homœopathic symptomatology? Thus, Rosenmueller has found by his many dissections, in the commencement of the revolutionary war between France and the Allied Powers, that many individuals of the western and southern nations of Europe, possess two or more small

additional spleens, whereas the northern and eastern nations have but one. So is it also well-known, that the former are more affected by one kind of tape-worm, (Tænia lata, Brems.) the northern and eastern by another (Tænia cucurbitina.) If it be so indispensable for the never failing homœopathic treatment, (see Organon from §§ 77 to 92,) and Dr. Hering (p. 22, l. c.) to know minutely the external place of the complaint, whether the symptoms appear on the right or left limb, it would seem of much greater importance to know the abnormal situation and formation of one or more important organs, which as above stated, are frequently observed in post mortem examinations only, although no symptoms whatever existed previously during life. According to the great worth claimed by homœopathists for their minute symptomatology, how could they consistently answer for their treatment, if a patient dies and presents to them in a post mortem examination, as many instances are on record, the total defect or a surplus of parts on which depended a considerable portion of their symptoms? But with all their great respect for "trifles and unheard of niceties," the proceedings of the homœopathists, even with regard to symptoms, are so defective and strange that, excepting the immense number of singular feelings, it appears almost as if the human body were in their eyes hollow like a polypus or a volvox globator, offering only a surface to the superficial observer. We have at least been unable, in the vast multitude of their symptoms, which often amount to upwards of a thousand for one drug, to discover proper remarks of the necessity of closely investigating the functions of the respiratory, digestive and other highly important organs by minutely examining their morbid excrementitious matters, the expectorated mucus or pus, the urine, &c., though these signs are extremely important in the diagnosis of many diseases: thus a knowledge of the chemical condition of the urine is indispensable, in order to ascertain in lithiasis, whether phosphate of lime, uric acid, or what other matter predominates, so as not to increase the disease from ignorance, instead of alleviating it. Are not these data, at least, as valuable as what Dr. Hering thinks *important* minutely to examine "a small wart of long standing upon the right "cheek," a "weakness of the right ankle," or a "proneness of the "same to frequent sprains," (see l. c. p. 22), &c., or as Hahnemann's large catalogue of feelings, many of which are newly created by him only to satisfy his and his disciples' most extrava-

gant fancy, and which are even to the German often so strange, that scarcely any one can form a clear conception of them? The homœopathical symptomatology, according to its *many and great* requisites, must be, of course, entirely inapplicable, when the patient has only one foot or arm, and those persons crippled in birth or by accident, are also so unfortunate, as to be excluded, when sick, from all the "great blessings" of this "new art of "healing," since hitherto no experiments with drugs have been instituted with such persons. The high value which homœopathists ascribe to the most subtle shades of symptoms, the names of which require the minutest acquaintance with the German language, (some of Hahnemann's expressions are foreign to this and to every language,) must render the large collection of drug- and disease-symptoms comprehensible only by Germans, who have studied, or rather learned by heart homœopathia for years. Thus the ridiculous opinion, that a physician can be skilful only in his own country, and must be considered in a foreign land inferior to a native, may he be ever so superior in professional education, talent, experience, &c., is indirectly advocated by homœopathia; though this opinion is excusable only in a man destitute of general scientific education, however distinguished he might be as an editor, poet, &c. For a man of a good general education should be sufficiently acquainted with the encyclopædical abstract of all sciences, so as to know also what materially belongs to the medical profession; he should know even by his common sense, that at least anatomy, physiology, pathology, &c., must be less national than other sciences, if he thinks them not altogether the same over the whole globe. The differences of climate, the epidemic and endemic diseases &c. of a foreign country, must be sufficiently known to every well educated physician, so that he can adapt the rational principles of the profession to any case with the same facility in a foreign land as in his native country. Indeed! this opinion, which we have frequently heard expressed by men of high standing in different countries, must appear as foolish, as if any body were to assert that only an American can describe minutely the geographical, geological, and all similar conditions of his country, because, besides this singular birth-right, he has travelled in American steamboats, rail-road-cars, &c., and vice versa, that an able American astronomer or geologist could not claim any minute knowledge of a foreign distant country, because he was not born there, and did

not live there from his infancy. Humphrey Davy says very correctly, in one of his speeches, " science, like that nature to which " it belongs, is neither limited by time nor space; it belongs to the " world, and is of no country and of no age." But homœopathists may justly be considered as " glebæ adscripti," not only on account of the difficulties mentioned, but on account of the great differences of climate, customs, and particularly the abuse of substances, " classed by him (Hahnemann) among the important remedial " substances;" all of which must necessarily lead the practice of German homœopathists, in foreign countries, to results very different from the experiments with drugs instituted at Leipzig and Coethen; and if they wished to be in any manner consistent, they should commence a new series of experiments with drugs on healthy persons, as accurate as those of their master, before they venture to practise in any foreign country with safety. How, for instance, can they conscientiously prescribe the virtue developed from an atom of opium for Turks, and other nations who daily use very large allopathic doses of it? How can they administer to the inhabitants of the Phillippine islands, and other tropical countries, who are surrounded with forests of cloves, cassia, pepper, and so many other plants, constantly impregnating the atmosphere with the largest allopathic doses of substances, classed by them amongst the most important remedial agents? What effect can be well expected if a native of these regions should smell in a severe malady on " a sugar-pellet not larger than a hemp-seed," and moistened with an infinite part of a grain of such an " im- " portant remedial substance," of which he has inhaled large quantities, at least thirty times every minute, during, perhaps, upwards of sixty years? Homœopathists, faithful to Hahnemann's cunning advice, (see Chron. Dis. Vol. I. p. 200), to avoid undertaking the treatment of patients, who have been previously marred by an allopathist, must consistently renounce all practice, where " the miserable, clumsy, and automatically acting nature," has been the murderous allopathist. Unfortunate nations! In return for the great and extensive blessings which nature has hitherto bestowed upon the inhabitants of the tropics, they are at present visited by two severe adversities; their valuable property will henceforth be entirely worthless, since in future, instead of many Indiamen, annually arriving, with their valuable cargoes of drugs and spices, the smallest vessel once very century will be fully sufficient to provide

all Europe and America with the requisite quantity of these drugs and "important remedial substances," and in addition, these unfortunate people are unqualified for all the benefits of "the great "discovery, which with blessings on its wings, reached to every "quarter of the earth."* The best advice which we can give them from true commiseration is, to join with the many ruined druggists, apothecaries and obstinate allopathists of all other sections of the globe, and to migrate to "Egypt the land of monsters," or to the "sanguinary gold-coast," in order to partake at least there of the great blessings of homœopathia, if they are willing to believe the cheerful reports of the respected author of the "Concise View," on page 18.

The great veneration paid by all the homœopathists to their "illustrious" master, may be pardonable, particularly when they consider themselves the blessed apostles of him, with whom the healing art has "dawned" and has continued "brilliantly" to shine, like summer's brightest mid-day. Let them continue to say to the American people, "no error is possible," "injury cannot "indeed result from a false selection." Let them tell also that the very existence of the human understanding has begun with Samuel Hahnemann, and that since *his* discovery all premature death by disease, would have ceased to afflict man, if the allopathic murderers were less obstinate. How many allowances have mankind been forced to make to infatuated fanatics in every century! But after disparaging all other medicine, all learning and experience, let them not wantonly destroy also the last remnant of

* To prove that our sympathy for those unfortunate nations is not visionary, we will state, that on reproaching homœopathists for their failures in different cases, contradicting their bold assertions to cure all diseases so easily, safely and quickly, some of them answered for their defence: that in large, and especially in commercial cities, their treatment *sometimes* fails, on account of the many "*remedial influences*," diffused in the atmosphere. One of the principal homœopathic remedies, the thorn apple, (Datura stramonium, L.) will consequently be quite ineffectual in cities, like New York and Philadelphia, where the surrounding country abounds with that exceedingly poisonous plant. We always considered it very wrong that this and similar poisonous plants should be suffered to grow in abundance near dwellings, as they may frequently be very injurious, particularly to children. But now we have still greater reason to call the attention of the civil authorities to this nuisance, in order not to deprive themselves and their fellow-citizens of the great benefits of homœopathia. The bad influences of other remedial agents, such as coffee, saffron, capsicum, imported from abroad, tobacco and even parsley, (vid 26, l. c.)—this plant hitherto considered so innocent and wholesome—will cease spontaneously, as soon as this newly discovered law of nature shall be acknowledged as indispensable to health, and "the domestic felicity of growing thousands here as well as in Germany," (see Concise View, page 29.) Why are not England, France, and the many other countries also included in this prophecy of Dr. Hering? Are they not also christians? or by what have they made themselves unworthy of the blessings of "the great truth?"

the merits of the deserving professional men who have existed and still exist, by such barefaced falsehood and bold ignorance, as we read in the following remarks, made by the author of the "Concise View," in the idiom of his party, (on page 22, of his C. V.) "Hahnemann was the first physician who recognized it as indispensable in any disease, to regard man as a whole." Does the learned Dr. Hering not know, that Empedocles who lived long before Hippocrates, about 24 centuries ago, has considered man *as a whole*, in his work "on the philosophy of nature," where he states that love combines the dissimilar and hatred the similar parts of the four elements, which are contained in the *whole* body; which remark is attended to by Aristotle, who himself had such clear conceptions of man as a whole, that on a nearer comparative analysis of their respective conceptions, the author of homœopathia would rather lose than gain. Does he not know that Hippocrates by his terms: φυσις, Θειον, Νομον, proved the same; that also Aretæus, Galen, Helmont, Ernestus Stahl, Albertus Haller, like all other real great reformers of medicine, have *considered man as a whole*, under the different expressions of psyche, archaeus, soul, vital power, sensibility, irritability, &c.* No medical doctrine has ever been so

* We would recommend to Dr. Hering and his homœopathic brethren the study of the history of medicine, particularly the learned and ingenious work of our respected friend, Professor Hecker of Berlin, whose "*Geschichte der Heilkunde, nach Quellen bearbeitet*, in two volumes, *Berlin*, 1822 *and* 1829," is more pragmatical and concise than the celebrated work of Professor Curt Sprengel. They would think then with more modesty of themselves, with more respect of the talents and exertions of really great men, and would also gain some useful instruction from the study now considered by them as "learned lumber." Lauth in his interesting work, "De l'esprit de l'instruction publique, Strasbourg, 1816," says very correctly on page 142, "*l'histoire d'unes cience contient l'histoire des erreurs de l'esprit humain; les connaitre c'est posseder les moyens de les éviter, tandis que, par leur ignorance, chaque homme est exposé á y retomber.*"—The well educated physician considers not only man, but also the plan of treatment of every case, as a whole, which therefore in most cases is best executed by one; hence, he is reluctant to yield to one of the most erroneous prejudices of the public in regardto medical consultations. Laymen being generally ignorant of the philosophical spirit of rational medicine, and of the higher mental requisites of a judicious treatment, consider it as depending only upon the acuteness of the external senses and a faithful memory; and hence that six eyes are naturally able to see three times as much as two, and that three doctors can remember a symptom and a useful remedy three times as well as one. These ideas may be correct in regard to the homœopathists, whose whole talents consist in remembering many thousand symptoms, and who by the aid of a brother homœopathist have less need of going home to consult their horn-books, before they prescribe their atoms; as they generally do, according to Hahnemann's direction. But in regard to rational medicine this prejudice is of great injury, for the following reasons: the conscientious physician, never prepossessed by his own learning and talent, will also feel bound from honesty towards his colleagues, who are charged to act with him harmoniously, not to alter his treatment without their consent. In urgent cases therefore, many consultations might be required daily, which cannot be attended by physicians who are engaged in but a moderate practice, and the most auspicious moments to relieve or to save the patient, by an instantaneous alteration of the plan of treatment adopted before might easily be

narrow in its conceptions, so destitute of all reasonable conjectures, and has therefore *less* considered man as a whole than homœopathia, in regarding the superficial symptoms and delusive feelings of the patient as the only true leading thread in the dark pathway of medical practice; excluding all higher mental faculties, all reasoning about the immense and constant influence of the vast multitude of the surrounding physical and mental agents; rejecting all reference to any cause whatever, &c. It is true, that the history of medicine presents, from its beginning, a motley list of the most imaginary and absurd conceptions about the causes of diseases, and this will continue to be so, more or less, because probably it was and will ever remain impossible for any mortal being to know exactly what life really is, and in what it essentially consists; all conjectures of the proximate causes of the different diseased states, have been and always will remain hypothetical. "Latent ista omnia crassis occultata et circumfusa tenebris; ut nulla acies humani ingenii tanta sit, quæ penetrare in cœlum, terram intrare possit.—

for ever lost. This will be the case, even where the physicians agree in their views and in their professional creed, as is probably not the case with two out of a hundred. If the professional views of two or more consulting physicians differ, the situation of the patient is much worse, as the treatment then is generally the result of a compromise of two or more mostly diametrically opposite opinions, combined from mutual courtesy or from prudence, neither of them being willing to be responsible for the result of his plan, when seriously opposed by the other. The public, unaware of these great inconveniences, will from bad customs, show or fashion, insist in proportion to their wealth, upon the consultations of more or less physicians, and will therefore frequently see members of their families dead, or otherwise injured, who if they were poor and forced to feel satisfied with the advice of only one good physician, would have been saved. The more ingenious the proposed two plans of treatment, the less probability is there of success, provided both be followed, or a third mode be formed from them. Two empirics, therefore, will agree together better than two rational physicians of different schools and practical views.—Every work depending upon the higher functions of the human intellect, upon conjectural principles, and upon a rational plan to be immediately changed according to circumstances which happen, should always be considered best performed by one; the probability of success in medical treatment may justly be considered as inverse to the number of consulting physicians, and the true benefit derived by the patient from medical attendance is generally equal to the fraction of one divided by the number of consulting physicians. Even the errors of a physician are observed and remedied by himself better than by another, and many successful modes of treatment are frustrated by the frequent change of physicians. This remark is intimately connected with a no less important inconsistency, likewise arising from want of sound reflection on the part of the public generally, in regard to medicine. Many persons have but slight confidence in the healing art, and consider it useless to consult a physician in the beginning of a disease, but they are anxious for his assistance when they become more seriously affected. We should think that if the confidence in the healing art is but small, it should consistently decrease in proportion with the difficulties to be removed, so that it must appear more advisable to call medical assistance in the beginnning of a disease, when all the morbid processes are but trifling, and easily removed, than at a later time, when by long duration and perhaps wrong measures, the first cause and its simple effects have been changed into a series of more or less complicated and aggravated morbid processes. A child may change the course of the largest river at its source, but no human power can alter its current at a considerable distance.

(*Cic. acad. quæst.*) But this does not prevent us from comparing the different manifestations and conditions of man's life with those of other living organized bodies, which we can observe more minutely, and submit to our experiments; nor from considering the phenomena and laws of universal nature, and their influence on the body in its different states, from which collectively we may conclude upon the state of things in diseases and upon the best means of remedying them in a manner, which, though not satisfactory to our unattainable ideal of certainty and perfection, yet fills our hearts with gratitude to a merciful Providence. But being unable to attain a consummate insight into the causes, shall we therefore desist from thankfully and rationally using all that the infinite wisdom and mercy of our Creator has granted to our intellect, and offered to our investigation? Thus, ought the natural philosopher to renounce his belief in a power of gravity, and observe only its phenomena, without establishing the said general principle and its laws, because he cannot and will never see or grasp the power itself? Supposing even that it will soon be found, to depend only upon a modification of the universal electro-chemical or magnetical agent, will not the very nature of this power simply change the form of the great mystery, and give rise to many new hypotheses, however much the principle may be simplified? Indeed it is extremely inconsistent and absurd that, while on one side homœopathists are more credulous and superstitious than ever a class of men have been, and affect to be so pious and faithful as to consider the investigation of the causes of natural phenomena a heavy sin; they are on the other side such strict sceptics, as almost to require laying down before them visibly and palpably, the matter of gravity itself, if it should exist, or any similar agency of nature, in the same manner as they can see and grasp "a small wart of long standing upon the right cheek," and are such infidels as to think their wisdom paramount to the vital powers, and to regard these always as injurious in diseases, if they do not assist them! We may justly ask Dr. Hering and his brethren: who considers man most as a whole, he who is contented simply to observe and write down the symptoms which are gained from true statements, or which are elicited from such defective experiments as we have mentioned, without any minute ratiocination or any higher intellectual exertion; or he, who not content with what is only obvious to his senses, is anxious to inquire minutely into the probable causes and their

connection with the accurately observed various effects, in order to establish general principles, which are applicable to many cases, without any reference to but seldomly similar, and mostly illusive symptoms? Who values man practically more as a whole, the homœopathist, who according to his doctrine, believing that the developed virtues of drug-atoms are only to be applied with success through the mouth or the nose, and therefore rejects the use of all external remedies; or the rational physician, who considers every point of the living body to be endowed with a proportionate and modified part of the same power, which animates and moves the whole, so that any appropriate influence upon the smallest point, will be distributed over all the systems, organs and parts of the living individual; and who believes on that account, that a great many diseases may be radically cured only by the use of external remedies, or by psychical directions? Homœopathia with its maxim, similia similibus curantur, would therefore justly be the last of all medical doctrines which could pretend with propriety to consider man *as a whole*, even if all experiments should fully confirm the correctness of the said maxim, much less so however, with its great deficiencies, delusions, contradictions, inconsistencies and absurdities.

Admitting that Hahnemann has in good faith adopted his doctrine, still it appears that he was misled by many observations which he claims to have discovered, but which were observed long before his time: viz. that powerful drugs, applied in a stronger dose or for a longer time than is necessary for removing the disease, produce symptoms which apparently belong to the subdued disease itself, but which are caused mostly by the surplus of the given drug; or in cases where the drug was not required, and where the original disease nevertheless disappeared, upon the improper selection of the drug. It was, for instance, known long before Hahnemann's first publication of his doctrine, and it was explicitly remarked by all eminent authors, that mercury, if used without sufficient reason, or if continued too long and in too large doses for syphilitic diseases, frequently produces symptoms resembling those of syphilis, and which do not subside, until the use of mercury is suspended and an opposite treatment adopted. But it would certainly be very poor diagnosis, if a physician should consider mercurial and syphilitic ulcers as identical; they are similar to each other, but not alike, as is also proved by the suc-

cessful mode of treatment generally followed by all judicious practitioners: hence the former were termed also, long before Hahnemann's doctrine, "mercurial ulcers", (Mercurial-Geshwuere) and the complex of all the symptoms produced by misapplied mercury was called "mercurial disease" (Mercurial-Krankheit;) this is, mutatis mutandis, quite the same as the term drug-sickness used by Hahnemann, and considered by his infatuated followers to be as gigantic a discovery as if he had found the quadrature of the circle. The same may be said of other remedies; if applied in too large doses, they will injure always in a direct proportion to their efficacy, to their dose, to the age, the constitution, the habit, the idiosyncrasy of the patient, etc. etc. They could not injure otherwise than by producing a diseased state, manifested by some symptoms. But impartial observation will show, that the drug given in excess, will rarely produce a state, which originated *directly* from the specific properties of the given drug, expressed by Hahnemann as drug-sickness (Arzney-Krankheit;) it will only cause a bad effect in general, depending upon the just named individual conditions, and observable either by another disease totally different from the former, or by one combined with a higher or lower degree of the old disease, or also by a more protracted convalescence. Not only the drug, but any thing else which the sick person has improperly taken may have these effects. Thus, for instance, of three apoplectics, one has eaten too much *salted* hering, and becomes violently delirious, another has indulged too much in water melons, and gets cholera, and the third was intemperate with whiskey, and is affected with blood-spitting; nobody perhaps but an homœopathist, would be so foolish as to term the first case *herring-sickness;* the second, *water-melon-sickness*, and the third *whiskey-sickness*, and no one but a homœopathist, would recommend to the first a microscopic slice of a herring; to the second, that of a water-melon, and to the third, the virtue developed from whiskey.—Hahnemann's observations therefore in support of the homœopathic maxim before us, do not depend upon the correctness of that maxim, but upon the natural consequences of all agents which are used in excess—omne nimium vertitur in contrarium. A relatively small quantity of wine, opium, etc. for instance, exhilarates, a larger one makes morose and drowsy; to quote a common-place occurrence, a carpenter who intends to fas-

ten a board, loosens it again by using too many nails and striking too much. Many similar incidents often happen in sickness, and may be explained by considering the healthy state as a parallelism of two straight lines, and the diseased state as a divergence of the same, which increasing at every moment of its duration, increases also the difficulties in re-establishing the parallelism or health; but it is obvious, that a power acting with more force than is required merely to re-establish the parallelism, will produce a similar and still larger divergence on the other side, and thus prove more injurious than beneficial, though it did not depend upon the wrong *quality* but upon the disproportionate *quantity* of the force applied.—Hahnemann is not aware that he himself nullifies his maxim of homœopathia, by very judiciously saying on the third page of his Organon :—" According to common sense the cause of any thing can never be the thing itself." We would only add to this negative proposition, which affects the old and long unsettled dispute about the identity of the proximate cause of a disease with the latter itself—the *cause* of any effect will much less destroy the *effect* of a dissimilar and even not of a similar cause. Common sense must adopt equal causes for equal effects; the same reasoning is applicable to two or more effects, really similar to each other in most of their single parts and vice versa.—To explain this more clearly, let us suppose the drug, d, to be the cause, c, of a certain number of drug-symptoms, s, in healthy persons, and let u call X the unknown cause of the symptoms, S, of the natural disease, called D. If we now meet with these similar symptoms, or S, in a natural disease, D, it would be contrary to all common senseto conjecture that d must destroy S, because it has produced s, which is similar to S; any one would more reasonably think, that it must sooner increase S and D belonging to it, because in all probability if s is quite similar to S, then the unknown cause X of S and its D, must be also similar to c of s; and as c is said to destroy absolutely S and its D, it destroys what its similar X always generates, which is absurd. It is here immaterial whether X, the unknown cause and S or D, its effect (proximate cause and disease,) are the same or not; the just reproach of Hahnemann, and of some of his reflecting disciples, that we know nothing certain about the proximate causes of diseases, does not the least affect our conclusions, since by adopting X, we admit that we do

not know exactly *the* cause, but only *a* cause. If he on his part, does admit no cause X, then he adopts an effect which has no cause; if he admits one, then he admits what we have just proved to be absurd.—We see by this dilemma, that even in regard to the similarity of symptoms, the homœopathic doctrine is merely seemingly correct.—True, Hahnemann says, (Org.: § 7.) "The physician, "in his treatment, is aided by data which most probably were the "*cause* of the acute disease, and by the most prominent incidents "of the whole history of the chronic disease, in order to ascertain "its *fundamental cause*," &c. But who would believe that this his judicious advice, expressed by him moreover in italics, is retracted by him in the same work, and on the same page, where he says, "Is not that which is recognisable by our senses, in the symp- "toms of diseases, the same with that which is internally existing "and not recognisable in itself? Is not the latter the side unat- "tainable and unrecognisable by us; but the former that side of "*the same disease*, which is evidently and positively recognisable "by our sound senses, and given to us by nature as the principal "object of cure? Who can prove the contrary? Is it not there- "fore foolish to make the invisible, internal state of any disease, "the state termed *prima causa morbi*, the object of cure, but to "reject, and haughtily to contemn, the sensibly and clearly ob- "servable side of the same disease, the symptoms which chiefly "speak to us as objects of treatment?"

And again, on § 12 of the same work, he says, "Whereas, "therefore, the removal of all the recognisable symptoms and in- "cidents of the disease removes also these changes, on which the "latter is founded—of course, therefore, the totality of the dis- "ease—it follows, that it is the duty of the physician only to re- "move the symptoms, in order to erase and to destroy, at the "same time, the internal changes; of course, therefore, the total- "ity of the disease, the *disease itself*."

We leave it to the acuteness of the impartial critic to select any sense from this motley phraseology: for instance, how it is possible to reconcile with common sense, that the symptoms of a disease and the latter itself, are absolutely *the same*, and nevertheless *not the same;* we should think if both are the same, *both* must be also *recognisable*, or *unrecognisable*, &c. If the critic succeeds, after his great exertion, he will observe the grossest contradictions in

these quotations.—In regard to the maxim, similia similibus curantur, Hahnemann was consistent in his practice only to the utmost extreme, until a few years ago, when he substituted for it, his "*great truths*."

The following few interesting specimens may satisfy the curiosity of our indulgent reader, and show the practical application which Hahnemann has made of this maxim.

If a man has taken his dinner too hastily, has swallowed many indigestible things, has drank too much spirituous liquors, or has eaten some tainted food; in short, if it be evident that he has injured his stomach in some such manner before he fell sick, every man of common sense would prescribe a contrarium, viz. an emetic, as the best remedy; the beneficial effects of which are moreover confirmed by innumerable instances. Hahnemann thinks, in his Organon, (pp. 6 and 7) such a real *causal* treatment, imaginary and highly obnoxious, and, instead of the emetic, recommends, as the best remedy, *to smell* of a sugar-pellet, made of starch and sugar, not larger than a hempseed, and slightly moistened with a *high solution* of the juice of Pulsatilla; that is, at least, with the $\frac{1}{10^{60}}$ part of a grain of the said juice, or *a fraction equal to one, divided by one with sixty zeros.*

On Org. p. 59, Hahnemann quotes F. H. Lange, an old author on domestic medicine, who has found nutmeg salutary in hysterics. This *single* authority is sufficient for him to add, "Of course "for no other than the same homœopathic reason; since, accord- "ing to F. Schmid and Cullen, it also caused, when given in large "doses to healthy persons, a *fainting of the senses* and a general "senselessness." That any substance, even the most innocent and wholesome food and drink, when taken to excess, will always cause, in persons easily subjected to hysterics, etc. such affections, and that none but a fool would draw from such a single instance any conclusion, is no object of consideration to the close-thinking homœopathists; who, however, find no fault that their master rejects, on the other side, all statements confirmed by thousands of trust-worthy men. This and similar inferences, drawn from domestic substances, by Hahnemann, refute his assertion, on page 53, where he explains, why such large doses of homœopathically acting drugs were found salutary by many authors quoted by him,

though they must have rather been of great injury. He states, that this may be ascribed to the use of the drugs, by which they have lost their efficacy; or to their operation as cathartics, by which they were soon evacuated; or also to the simultaneous use of drugs, which acted as antidotes to them. The first reason cannot be true of such substances as nutmeg, and is also a supposition demanding proof; because every one will believe, that, among all these distinguished men, some at least have been honest, and anxious to administer to their patients the best drugs and the best preparations. The second reason refutes his explanation of the first—and after-operations, and if combined with the third reason, contradicts the absolute and unconditional salutary effect of his homœopathic drugs.

Ladies, suffering from giddiness or oppression, must not object if their homœopathic doctor visits them smoking a pipe or a cigar; for, on page 55 of the Organon, Hahnemann proves the salutary effects of tobacco for such indispositions, by *only one* quotation from Diemerbroek, one of the greatest physicians in Amsterdam, two centuries ago, who cured himself from similar affections during an extensive epidemic; though probably this ingenious Dutchman did it merely, as many physicians still do in Germany and Holland on similar occasions, because he found his pipe very pleasant and useful for offensive smells, and protective against infection, to which he was exposed as an able and extensive practitioner.

On page 61 of the same work he asks whether, if any one being exposed to a cold wet air, take a little bitter-sweet, (Solanum dulcamara, L.) and catches a severe cold, it is not *a proof* that this plant *produces* the symptoms of a cold, and must therefore also *cure* colds? This "great genius, by whose *watchful* "*attention* to minutiæ a new era has dawned upon all the natural "sciences," as Dr. Hering tells the Americans, on page 24 of his Concise View, considers here as a mere nothing the influence of a cold wet air, which daily experience proves fully sufficient for producing a severe cold, a catarrhal or rheumatic fever, and frequently the most dangerous acute or chronic diseases. But he thinks the infinite part of this plant, which every body knows is quite inoffensive in small allopathic doses, to be so highly injurious, that it is not worth while for him to mention a cold damp air, even only as an accessory cause! No wonder, on pp. 246

and 247 of his Organon, he suggests explicitly to the homœopathic physician, not to mind the stories of their patients, relating, as the cause of their long sufferings, "a cold acquired long ago, "(by getting wet all over, or by a cold drink after over-heating,) a "fright, a distortion of a limb, (also "sometimes a bewitching, "&c."*) "All these things are *too trifling* to produce, in *healthy* "*persons*, diseases of long standing, which grow worse from year to "year, as is the nature of all chronic diseases arising from itch."

Among the great discoveries of Hahnemann, drawn from "his exceedingly pure and simple observations," we may name foremost his assertion, that ophthalmia, or inflammation of the eyes, is frequently caused by *Roses*. All must fly, therefore, from places

"Where o'er the verdant ground
"Her living carpet nature spreads;
"Where the green bower, with *roses* crown'd,
"In showers its fragrant foliage sheds."

Old authors mention to us many very singular causes which injure this, our noblest sense; and Ovid, in his Remed. Amor. lib. 2. already says,—

"Dum spectant oculi læsos, læduntur et ipsi,
"Multaque corporibus transitione nocent."

But hitherto nobody was aware of the great risk he runs by smelling this delightful gift of spring, this beautiful flower considered by all poets as the emblem of innocence! What reason has the old philosopher to make such a cruel accusation of our favorite flower, the Rose? Is it the result of *his* not "over-refined" chemical analysis, or, at least, of some experiments which, like so many others, *he* only has made? No: some obscure old medical author, who, as a stupid allopathist, deserves of course no credit for any thing else, has told him so: but as *he* says, nobody can doubt it, principally because rose-water is an old domestic remedy for inflamed or sore eyes. It could not, however, be so favorite a remedy in the spirit of the homœopathic maxim, similia similibus curantur, unless it produces ophthalmia; ergo, every one who smells of roses will unavoidably have his eyes inflamed.

Ancient authors must have been ignorant of the danger to

* We would advert here to this expression of Hahnemann, by which he ranks "bewitching" with other important causes, which are, in his opinion, erroneously alleged by the patient. The discussion about his third maxim will explain this more minutely.

smell of roses; for Cicero, (in Verrem. 11) states, that it was customary with the kings in Bithynia to fill the cushions of their beds or sofas with roses: and Virgil sings, "Nescio quis teneros oculos mihi fascinat agnos." It is also an object of curiosity to know, by what antidote the people in many oriental countries are protected against ophthalmia, who distil such large quantities of essential oil of roses, and use it so frequently as a cosmetic. We have never seen it mentioned by any traveller, not even by Lady Montague, that the beautiful Circassian girls suffer on that account with inflamed eyes. But no matter, it must be true! *he* says so, in his Organon, on pp. 59 and 60.

In our humble opinion, Hahnemann, by whom, according to Dr. Hering, on page 19, "the most important medicinal energies of nature have been investigated," could have recommended a much surer homœopathic remedy against inflamed eyes, drawn also from roses. Every one will certainly admit that few healthy men, or even animals, will escape from having their eyes inflamed, when pricked or scarified with the thorns of roses, for which Hahnemann could have quoted still older and also modern authorities; although this operation, called ophthalmoxysis, was originally performed with ears of barley or rye.

Samuel Hahnemann, whom we have seen so exceedingly averse to all names of diseases, enriches, however, the profession, on page 67 of his Organon, with a new disease, termed by him *contusion-sickness*. He says, that the symptoms of the drug-sickness, produced in healthy persons by the use of Arnica montana, L. are simito the symptoms which partly sometimes happen after a more or less violent contusion of a part. Arnica must therefore, of course, be considered as a specific remedy against the consequences of all contusions. In his opinion it is only downright allopathic nonsense to bleed, leech, foment, or even to resort to trepanning, in severe cases of such a kind; a trillionth or decillionth part of a grain of arnica-juice will cure all contusions easily, safely, and quickly.

It appears that Hahnemann's attention was particularly attracted by the less common German name, amongst half a dozen, for Arnica, viz. Fallkraut, (falling-herb). According to the many drug-sickness symptoms, mentioned in vol. I. of his Materia Medica,

it is a very singular plant: it makes, for instance, healthy persons exceedingly melancholy, and at the same time very gay. Preachers, lawyers, members of congress, in short, all who are and must be very eloquent, should be cautious not to take a dose of Arnica, for the same reason, as it is worth recommending to some particularly blessed married men, for the still greater promotion of their "domestic felicity," because it makes talkative, and of course where loquacity prevails it will cure it. (See Mat. Med. Vol. I, p. 504.)

In pure inflammatory fevers, encephalitis, or inflammation of the brain, with delirium, in which a few drops of a spirituous drink are considered by every allopathist as equivalent to poison, Hahnemann recommends (Organon, p. 73) strong wine in small doses, because a few cases are recorded where it has proved useful. By quoting (Organ. p. 73), in support of this luminous opinion an old treatise in Ephem. Natur. Cur. entitled, " febris ardens " spirituosis curata," he shows an ignorance hardly to be met with in a well educated physician, since febris ardens is not an inflammatory disease, but the same as *causus*, generally a typhus or putrid fever, where rational medicine has always considered good old wine a great and almost indispensable remedy. He recommends wine in encephalitis particularly, because, when taken in excess, it frequently produces, among other inflammatory symptoms, those of the tissues of the brain also, and ridicules, on p. 152, the common allopathist, who is so foolish as to give wine, in order to strengthen persons exhausted by long sufferings or by other causes, because its first effect (Erstwirkung) produces only the feelings of strength, and its after-action (Nachwirkung), is always exhausting and relaxing. He should, consistently, also recommend a sumptuous dinner with some dozens of hot spiced dishes as a very salutary remedy in inflammations of the brain, lungs,&c., where sleeplessness prevails, because the after-operation of such a dinner is to make one feel sleepy.—We know not why Dr. Hering, (l. c. p. 26,) objects to " the dieting system," and to " starva- " tion," since, as Hahnemann considers the after-operation so important, he must know that a small quantity of food administered to a person almost starved to death, will produce a very pleasant after-operation; and, to be consistent, the best mode of restoring persons, suffering by consumptive diseases, would be to starve and to diet them alternately.—It is lucky for the patients of homœopathists, that they are opposed to external remedies, and are bound

to prescribe such fancifully small doses. Their singular conceptions about the first-and after-operations, would sometimes induce some of their rude brethren to horse-whip their patients; for, provided no wounds are inflicted, the martyr of their "law of nature," will feel a very pleasant after-operation, when the dose has been applied. Rude allopathists and their patients are frequently in a similar manner deceived by the same feelings of ease and comfort, when powerful emetics, and similar injudicious prescriptions, have ceased to operate.

Hahnemann, though opposed to all external remedies, alludes, Org. p. 95, to the beneficial effects of fomentations with hot water over the head, when the brain is inflamed by a *stroke of the sun*, or if the head is in any other manner morbidly affected by its exposure to excessive heat: quite natural; because a dangerous inflammation of the brain arises from the same cause, and the mode of applying cold fomentations is considered one of the most superior allopathic remedies; and ergo—most foolish and murderous in his eyes.

The learned Dr. Hering proclaims to the world, on page 16 of his Concise View, that, "physicians must again become students, "and that they were unwilling to do:" we shall continue to prove how correct he is, but not only with regard to physicians, but to all mankind, interested in such great discoveries.—Hahneman, Org. p. 84, asks: "what will suffocate sooner than the vapor of burning sul- "phur? and the same vapor of burning sulphur," he says, "is found "to be the best remedy to revive persons asphyctic from other suffocat- "ing causes." Indeed! it is strange that this "great benefactor of his "race," did not recommend also the rope as an excellent remedy to revive asphyctic persons, since it is prima facie evident, that it answers extremely well his homœopathic maxim and the ingenious applications which he makes of it. How many worthy men would have been preserved to the world and their families, especially in a certain highly civilised country, if this marvelous homœopathic after-operation of a rope should have been known long since!—Is it not to be seriously deplored that "with blessings "on its wings, the great discovery reached to every quarter of the "earth"—so late!—We believe our Samuel abstained from minutely mentioning this further application of his reviving measures only on account of his professed aversion to all external remedies. Our conjecture appears confirmed by his comments on pages 93 and 94 of the same work; "electricity, as is known," he

says, " causes a shortening of the muscles, which resembles tha
" in convulsions, &c., and Theden restored by electricity a girl
" ten years old, who by lightning had lost her voice, and had be-
" come almost lame in her left arm, though her arms and legs
" were in a constant and involuntary motion, and her left fingers
" in a constant spasmodic contraction." We learn also from this remark, that, maugre the above quoted duplicity of Hahnemann and his disciples, in regard to the large and again small doses of drugs for their experiments on healthy persons, they are more in favor of the large than of the small ones for their trials on healthy persons, and that we have been correct in adopting the former as the basis of our discussion: for nobody, a " close thinking" homœopathist excepted, will deny, that a thunder-stroke contains a pretty large *allopathic* dose of electricity.

The conception of Hahnemann in regard to the protection of the cow-pox against small-pox is likewise very remarkable and contradictory to his maxim, similia similibus curantur. Discordant with his repeated and really blasphemous expressions in regard to the vital powers of nature, saying, for instance, on page 26 of his Organon, " The wretched and exceedingly imperfect effort of the
" vital power in curing acute diseases without assistance, is a spec-
" tacle which challenges all mankind to active commiseration,
" and us to the exertion of all our intellectual powers, to put an
" end to this self-torment, by a genuine salutary cure, &c."—he exclaims on page 80 of the same work, " can cow-pox protect
" against small-pox otherwise than in a homœopathic manner?
" This disease which, besides other similarities with the small-pox,
" appears only once during the whole human life, leaves the same
" deep cicatrices and presents also the same swelling of the axillary
" glands, a similar fever, the same areola, and even the same oph-
" thalmia and convulsions, which the small-pox produces. The
" cow-pox would extinguish and cure the small-pox even after it
" had appeared, provided the small-pox were not stronger than
" the cow-pox; the latter wants therefore only a higher degree of
" strength to cure the disease which, according to the law of
" nature, is required in addition, to the homœopathic similarity for
" the cure. We can therefore apply this homœopathic remedy
" only in advance, before the small-pox affects the body," &c. Leaving unnoticed many material objections which could be made to these false statements, in subjects of daily occurrence to the

profession, they contradict palpably the homœopathic maxims: 1st. That no homœopathic remedy can be used in too small a dose, &c., because, the smallest quantity of vaccine virus used for vaccination, will always be many billion times larger than any homœopathic dose of a drug; 2d. According to the maxim similia similibus curantur, and according to Hahnemann's explanations, as stated above, it is not explained why the cow-pox should not extinguish, check or destroy the small-pox at any time of its existence, as all homœopathic drugs are said to do, which therefore also are *not* used as *prophylactics*, but as *remedies* for the *existing* disease. Should this not be the meaning of Hahnemann, he could not claim to cure diseases already existing, and it would follow therefrom, that every person, being ignorant what disease may befal him, would be obliged to take, through his whole lifetime, every month at least, one dose of all known homœopathic drugs, if he wishes to be protected against all diseases.

The author of the Concise View recommends, (page 17) in conformity with his master, the application of heat to a scalded limb, and on the contrary, cold to a frost-bitten one. Hahnemann accounts on page 157 of his Organon for this advice, by the common experiment, in which, if one hand only is bathed with hot water, it feels of course much warmer than the other hand left free (first-operation, Erstwirkung,) but removed from the hot bath and dried, it will afterwards feel colder than the other, (after-operation, Nachwirkung,) and the contrary will prove true if ice be used. Both our authors support these experiments by instances on record, in which the treatment performed in accordance with these experiments succeeded. Ignorant of the physical causes of these phenomena, which, as belonging to the third maxim, we shall discuss afterwards, they take no notice of the majority of cases, where cold applied to scalded limbs, and warmth to those which were frost-bitten, afforded safe relief and cure, provided that both were judiciously applied in respect to the degree of the affection.

On the same page of his pamphlet, Dr. Hering mentions, in further corroboration of homœopathia, that the cure of certain cases of acidity of the stomach, suggested to him by an American, may be best effected, not with magnesia, a contrarium, but with lemon juice, a simile. We doubt very much whether he would succeed in curing all kinds of acidity of the stomach with lemon-juice, even in allopathic doses, as it was probably used by our

American colleague. The learned Dr. Hering ought to know, that other acids, as particularly Haller's elixir of vitriol, were long since highly recommended for the same symptom, but nevertheless they fail in many cases, where drugs very different from, or rather opposite to acids, as the alkalies, aromatics, bitters, &c., are more salutary. These cases, though generally of minor importance, may clearly prove the preference of general principles, drawn from causes and not merely from symptoms. Rational medicine does not consider pyrosis itself as a disease, but only as a common symptom of dyspepsia, which may co-exist or not with the latter. One who uses lemon-juice or any similar remedy to cure pyrosis, upon the principle similia similibus curantur, will unquestionably cure those cases in which the cause is removed by it, as in hyperæsthesia or paræsthesia of the stomach, in some functional disorder of the liver, &c., but he will be unsuccessful and even do injury in many others, in anæsthesia of the stomach, hysteria, &c. which another one, trusting to the opposite but less erroneous maxim, contraria contrariis curantur, will perhaps cure by his antacids. But there are many cases which will yield to neither method, and where both practitioners will fail, because they are merely guided by delusive symptoms, whereas the rational physician viewing correctly the proper cause of this symptom, will resort probably with immediate success, to the proper medicines, without believing the processes in the stomach to be similar to those instituted by the chemist in his retort or crucible.

An over-estimate of the symptoms, particularly of those which may be referred to topical diseases, without due reference to the much more important anamnesis, or the minute scrutiny of the occasional causes of a disease, may in many cases be very fatal to the patient. We have already alluded to these subjects above, and hope, on another occasion, to detail the results of our practice, and the great injuries which we have frequently seen inflicted by similar rude modes of a mere symptomatic treatment. We may, however, be permitted to add a few words, illustrating still more the great injuries of a merely symptomatic method, which will affect homœopathia particularly, when, as may be expected, its votaries will soon abandon the third maxim about the small doses, and merely sustain for a short time the second, about the similarity of the drug-and-disease-symptoms. Two cases may

not only present similar symptoms, but, may also be rightly referred to the same affected organ, and nevertheless differ so widely, that the life of the patient is endangered in a few hours, by the least disregard of the previous state of the patient, and of what happened before the attack. In illustration of this, we cannot find a better instance, than the illusive similarity of a high degree of intoxication to delirium tremens, so satisfactorily explained by Dr. Samuel Jackson, of Northumberland in Pennsylvania, in his able treatise, published in the American Journal of Medical Sciences, No. XIV. Feb. 1831. We have long entertained the opinion, that the two opposite modes of treatment, so frequently recorded by faithful authors, must depend upon an error in the anamnesis; some recommending, as the abstract of their practice, Sutton's method with large doses of opium, others, for the same reason, the strict antiphlogistic method, by bleeding, leeching, cold fomentations, &c. Intoxication and delirium tremens are neither of them as frequent in the place of our former residence, nor over the whole of Germany at present, as they are in this country, though intemperance has been, according to the oldest statements on record, among the most prominent vices of the Germans. Tacitus for instance, says in his Germania: "Diem noctemque continuare "potando, nulli probrum, crebræ ut inter vinolentos, rixæ, raro "conviciis, sæpius cæde et vulneribus transiguntur."—In a hospital and large dispensary, entrusted to our care for upwards of fifteen years, we very seldom saw a case, and therefore we only could observe the correctness of Dr. Jackson's remarks in but a few instances.* But it is evident, in this respect, that so much does not depend upon the similarity of the symptoms, which is very great, as upon an acute induction, drawn from different particulars and forming together a clear ætiology, as the very foundation of a safe rational treatment. For, opium given in large doses to a highly intoxicated person, would unquestionably increase the

* We shall perhaps mention at another opportunity, the reasons why intemperance is now less common in Germany than in many other countries. We would mention here, only that the Germans are generally more intemperate in wine, and particularly in beer, than in brandy, and we think they do not become so easily drunk as the people in this country, owing probably to the greater uniformity of their climate, to their frequent amusements by music, dancing, and by other national pleasures and fêtes. It may also be easily explained by psychical principles, why cheerful entertainments lessen the inclination to the higher degrees of intemperance, and absorb or consume a considerable part of the noxious influence of liquors, whereas the propensity to intemperance in persons who live retired from company and are apt to muse, is not only greater but also in itself more ruinous.

danger of his state equally as much as a powerful antiphlogistic treatment would injure the other one affected by delirium tremens, whereas the inverse method would prove salutary to both of them. The rational physician, engaged in an extensive practice, will every day meet with similar cases, where life depends upon an equally minute distinction, acquired from the information of the previous and existing particular conditions of the case, and its more or less remote causes. Such minute and mostly very important data, which are known much better and more easily by the family physician than by another, enable him therefore, to detect the true cause of a disease much more quickly, and thereby, all other things being equal, more to benefit the patient.

We may refer also to the similarity of symptoms produced by different poisons, belonging to the same class, which if taken in a sufficient quantity, will soon destroy life, if proper aid be not immediately administered, which depends not only on the general treatment, but must also correspond to the specific chemical quality of the poison. Admitted that every metallic or narcotic poison will present on a very minute examination, besides the general symptoms of all metallic or narcotic poisons, also specific symptoms; but they are certainly not always observable immediately. A homœopathist, especially one of those finished without the least professional education in a couple of months, and relying only on his symptoms, would, as they generally do, particularly in such extraordinary cases, run home to consult his drug-symptom-text-book, then institute possibly, a long cross-examination and write down minutely its results, in strict accordance with Hahnemann's explicit advice, and at last he would apply the virtue developed from one of his drug-atoms, developed, according to similia similibus curantur, from the same poison which has caused the danger; and thus undoubtedly, as in many other less conspicuous instances, be the negative cause of the death of an unfortunate individual, who might probably have been restored, if a stomach-pump, the proper antidote, and other remedies prescribed by rational medicine, had been applied in time.

After attempting to demonstrate by the preceding remarks, that with our imperfect senses, we can by no means rely upon symptoms alone for a correct diagnosis, since *similar* symptoms frequently depend upon *very different* causes, we will now endeavour

to prove by a few instances, that also *very different* symptoms may be attributed in the same manner to *one and the same* cause, and that therefore very different diseases may be radically cured by the same treatment. Let us suppose that ten persons, alike in sex, age, apparent constitution, and other respects, have exposed themselves to the same obnoxious causes, for instance, after being excited and profusely perspiring from dancing, drinking spirituous liquors, &c. have exposed their feet to wet cold. In all probability each of them will be affected differently, in consequence of some particular local disposition, of which, however, none of them was ever before aware; one, for instance, will be attacked with pleurisy, another with angina, a third with ophthalmia, &c. &c. A rational physician, if called in, and informed of the occasional causes of their sufferings, which collectively have produced the proximate general cause of their different sickness, viz. checked perspiration, injured conductive capacity of the cutaneous nerves, plethoric accumulation of the blood in different organs with a propensity to inflammation, or the latter itself, &c. will probably cure them all readily, by the same method of treatment, varying only very slightly; according to the parts affected, such as removing the light from the inflamed eyes, forbidding much speaking to the pleuritic, &c.; he will probably attain his main object by prescribing warm stimulating foot-baths, gentle diaphoretics, &c. whilst the homœopathist, directing his whole attention only to the symptoms, after comparing them with the image of the corresponding drug-sickness, &c., not only loses much time to no purpose, but leaves perhaps all these patients uncured by the use of his drug-virtues developed from an atom of Aconitum for the pleuritis, of Pulsatilla for the ophthalmia, of Spongia usta for the angina, &c. &c. If, for instance, one of these patients is affected by gout, and is attacked by a chemosis, which, unless treated very actively by antiphlogistics, will destroy the eyes in less than twenty-four hours, the immense injury of such a nonsensical symptom atic treatment by an homœopathist will be still more evident.

In cases like these, where the connection between the cause of the morbid process and its consequences is so clear, the rational physician can generally restore health safely and quickly without recurring to symptoms; the morbid process not being yet complicated by the rapid progress of multiplied connections, either direct or

antagonistical, with the different systems and organs; the dependance of the effect upon its cause is so plainly manifest, as to admit a speedy restoration, being apparently almost like a mechanical connection between both, though we would by no means compare the vital actions to any mechanical power. In such cases rational medicine shines forth in splendor, and shows its great preponderance over all empiricism, so that an enlightened class of people, anxious to have the slightest indisposition removed by their physician, will enjoy, in a series of years, great advantages in their healthy conditions and vigour, if compared with another class, which call only for assistance upon their physicians when the disease has considerably advanced. In the machinery of an organised living body, and especially of man, which is so many times more complicated than the most compound artificial machine, and upon which so many, and even quite another world of mental influences are operating, the effect of a cause seldom remains stationary, without spreading and combining with many others sympathetically, which become again the cause of other effects, and so on reciprocally to an indefinite large number of causes and their effects, till the last of them are recognisable by us as symptoms. No homœopathist can deny this to be the course, if he attaches any meaning to Hahnemann's expressions, "first-, counter-, and after-" operation," and he must at least admit, that his object is not merely to remove the *symptoms*, but to remove the *disease* itself, or to *cure* the patient by removing the symptoms. If therefore a disease has lasted a long time, before the homœopathist has been called to attend, he, in referring only to the symptoms present, will not observe the symptom produced by the first original cause, (symptoma causæ) but the consecutive and different ones, which are very distantly referable to the first effect, resulting from the original cause, (symptomata symptomatum.) Even in successfully applying his drug to all the present symptoms, forming what the homœopathist terms, " the image of the natural disease, (Krankheitsbild.)" with all the minute prominent symptoms, their shades, &c., they do not affect the original symptoms, but only those which arise from the many preceding effects, all of which are more or less complicated and dissimilar to the former, as they are more or less distant from them by going through the many different periods and developments of the disease. If, therefore, Hahnemann's assertions should be credited, viz. that one atom of his drug, though taken only once a

week, or sometimes only once every six weeks, should be sufficient to "extinguish" all the causes and effects, or all the symptoms, the original as well as the consecutive, "without ever doing any injury," this alone would require an implicit belief in the supernatural powers of his virtues developed from atoms, which act almost with more judicious discernment than rational beings. These ratiocinations can alone explain easily, why the trials with the homœopathic method, instituted by homœopathists under the eyes of impartial observers, as we have stated in the beginning of this treatise, have either entirely failed, or have succeeded only in the same ratio with other similar cases, which were left entirely to the operations of nature. We doubt very much, whether by the multiplication of drug-symptoms, which, in some cases have already been increased to upwards of a thousand, the prophecy of Dr. Hering will ever be fulfilled, when he says, on p. 24, l. c. "in fu-
"ture times the new pathology will as far excel the old, as do the
"natural sciences of the present period those of the last century
"But, at the bed-side of the patient, the homœopathic physician
"is unmindful of this future science." (—no doubt, of course!—)
"His sole inquiry is after the symptoms, because the symptoms
"alone determine his choice of the remedy, and upon the fulness
"and accuracy with which these are noted, rests the entire ma-
"nagement of the cure. All, therefore, depends upon the correct
"examination of the patient, but not upon any possible opinions
"concerning the nature and essence of the disease, nor upon learn-
"ed views concerning its concealed seat."

We doubt whether the most zealous and partial opposer of this professional fanaticism could give a better description of it, than that which we read in these few lines. Though a faithful abstract of many similar expressions in Hahnemann's works, none indeed could express with more frankness the open tendency of homœopathia to the rudest empiricism. Beware of *any* possible *opinion!* Guard against *any views or conjectures* which might perhaps lead to the discovery of the *concealed seat* of the disease! Renounce *all* the higher *intellectual* faculties, and believe *blindly and implicitly* in the dictates of a man, who says, that the healing art begins with him, that he alone has discovered the great truth, by a superficial glance, without philosophy, without chemistry, without anatomy, physiology, and all the other sciences hitherto considered indispensable to spy the mysteries of nature; that he

alone knows how to expound her laws and to interpret her actions in the remotest recesses of animal life, hitherto concealed from all other mortal eyes! Such are the watch-words of these infatuated fanatics. How correctly Fr. Bacon says, in his work, De Augm. Scient. "Licet de factis ipsis, licet humani animi pignora sint "certissima, non prorsus tamen fidendum; nisi diligenter ac "attente pensitatis prius illorum et magnitudine et proprietate.— "Illud enim verissimum; fraus sibi in parvis fidem præstruit ut "majore emolumento fallat."

To say nothing of all other absurdities of this whole doctrine, if such maxims should ever prevail in the medical profession, it might be predicted with the most possible certainty, that all the great advantages acquired in medicine for many centuries would be totally lost and all advancements entirely checked.

No rational physician will deny the great value and necessity of a minute symptomatology, which, though erroneously considered identical with the diagnosis, only partly belongs to that important branch of practical medicine.—Symptomatology is as indispensable for the diagnosis, as records faithfully collected by the chronicler or annalist, are for the historian: but never will these be considered fully sufficient for a philosophical history of a civilized nation in any period of its existence; nor will the mere catalogue of the deeds and the fate of a man distinguished in history, even with the addition of his faithful likeness, be a substitute for his instructive pragmatical biography.

The rational physician, estimating the symptoms, not as the only or principal points, but as very uncertain and delusive signs, will, from the symptoms, (symptomatology) from the whole history of the case, and many other data, which have occurred previous to the attack (anamnesis and ætiology) form a whole (diagnosis), from which he derives a general plan of treatment, (general therapia) divided into more or less different sections, (special therapia) which he will retain or alter, according to circumstances, showing either the correctness or incorrectness of his whole plan and its single sections. He will consider a disease which has already lasted some time, as a compound of many causes and their effects originating from one fundamental cause, similar to a larger or smaller ball of thread, containing one nucleus, which he endeavours to unwind until he comes to the nucleus, to the primitive

cause itself, or at least to its primary effect.—His task resembles the untired exertions of a true philanthropist, who undertakes to rescue a wretched person, sunk by a bad education and by misfortune into vice and misery: he will notice minutely his countenance, the expressions of his thoughts and feelings, and even his negligent dress; but he will pay most particular regard to his true biography, he will scrutinize minutely the different causes and their effects obvious in the biography, until he can arrive at one original cause, and project a circumspect plan for successive operations, to remove the first cause, if possible; and will not fancy that he can make him sensible of the delights, happiness, and self-satisfaction of a virtuous life, by one moral speech, or, much less, by another dress: and only then, if he cannot find the primitive cause, or cannot successfully combat it, he will attempt to ameliorate or to remove the external conditions, the symptoms: he may, by so doing, afterwards succeed in ameliorating or removing the first cause also; but this evidently depends more on mere chance than the first plan.

With regard to the unwinding of the disease to its commencement from a simple or more or less compound cause, it is indeed very remarkable, how often a close observer will find nature pursuing this course in re-establishing health, sometimes even without medical assistance; though all advocates of methods which rely only upon symptoms, and especially homœopathists, have not the least conception thereof. Thus, severe inflammatory diseases of the serous membranes of the brain, or of the mucous membranes of the throat, of the intestines, etc. in children, frequently arising from a suppressed cold, or from a badly treated chronic eruption of the skin, &c. appear generally to be not safely cured, until the original local affection is re-established and properly treated. The profession has, on that account, in almost all ages, mistaken similar processes for critical evacuations, by which a morbid matter is thrown out of the body, which the fancy of the physicians presumes to be the only cause of the disease; whereas it is to be regarded merely as the natural consequence of the more energetic general vital reaction, and of the re-beginning healthy functions of the secretory organs, unable immediately to prepare a sound secretory or excretory matter; or of processes which tend to restore the former general degree of relative health, and endeavour also

to re-establish the less important disease; being the accessory and simultaneous acts of nature in her operations to restore health.

Such presumed critical evacuations or deposits, if forced by drugs directly, instead of judiciously supporting their beneficial cause, must do much injury. Critical symptoms, as well as the critical periods of most acute diseases, are for this reason, undoubtedly highly important, not only for the prognosis but also for the treatment, inasmuch as their appearance, after foreboding favorable symptoms and simultaneous marks, is mostly a sign, but not a cause of the patients approaching recovery; by following this suggestion, the great value of their minute knowledge, to be drawn from the writings of creditable practitioners of all ages and at the bed-sides of patients, will be increased rather than lessened. Wherever, in complicated cases, the profession acts in conformity with nature, we may consider it generally a certain sign of convalescence, if slighter symptoms, which accompanied the first outset of the disease, reappear; a process which clearly explains the suggestions above expressed, in regard to the numerous changes of the causes and their effects into other causes, &c., and which is very properly called by some modern German authors, retroformation (Rueckbildung.) In children, for instance, in whom nature operates more regularly, especially in regard to the re-productive processes, the recovery from very severe diseases, frequently arising from neglected cold, seldom fails, even under the continuance of the pathognomonical symptoms, when they begin to sneeze, and when their Schneiderian membrane rebegins to secrete mucus profusely; except in the last stages of scarlet fever, with diphtheritis maligna and inflammatory affections of the brain, where this symptom proves generally very ominous, or is, as the profession used to term such signs, only a symptomatic one.

Among the many morbid phenomena which caused the most erroneous suggestions, in the old medical schools as well as in homœopathia, we may mention such morbid functions as became habitual, or those which by their long continuance became not only compatible with tolerable good health, but seemed essentially to belong to the latter, so as to cause, when suppressed, severe diseases. The general opinion, still maintained by most physicians, that the suspension of the habitual morbid process itself, is the cause of a merely contemporaneous disease, is owing also to their superficial reliance upon symptoms, being not aware that the absence or coexistence of

two or more symptoms does not imply their dependence upon each other as cause and effect, but authorizes us rather to adopt with more propriety, a common cause, producing both the suspension of the habitual morbid function as well as the new disease. In consequence of these false conceptions their plan of treatment being in general exclusively directed to restore the suppressed habitual secretion, is usually injurious. Hahnemann, in his Organon and in his work on chronic diseases, considers all habitual morbid functions as produced by the rude and impetuously acting vital powers, which being, by this their allopathic mode of cure, incapable of directly removing the very cause of almost all the chronic diseases, namely itch, substitute for this general disease a local one, generally worse than the former. We shall soon see in what this, his latest doctrine, consists, and mention here only that the plan generally adopted by the profession, for the cure of such suppressed habitual morbid functions must frequently fail; if it however succeeds, the constitution of the patient is often more or less impaired by it, leaving him disposed either to a severer relapse of the same habitual disease or to some other chronic one, as all indirect treatment usually does. We have often observed these natural consequences of such erroneous medical treatment, for instance, when the suppressed hæmorrhoidal flux,* or the suppressed menstruation itself have been considered the causes of the disease, and patients suffering with the latter, and illtreated with repeated bleedings, leeches, the strongest emmenagogues, &c., fell, like many others, victims to

* This is not the proper place to discuss more minutely such topics; but from long experience we feel entitled to suggest that hæmorrhoids or piles, whether fluent or not, inherited or not, in young as well as in old persons, mostly depend not upon a plethora, or orgasmus in the vena portarum, obstructions in the liver and other abdominal organs, &c., nor upon a predominant venosity, so much advocated in modern times as the cause of many diseases, but upon a morbid action of the lower part of the spinal marrow, the nerves arising from it, and their important anatomical and functional connections with the abdominal and other ganglia. The different morbid affections heretofore named, may themselves be considered as the consequence of this cause; and this will be best explained by the intimate connexion of hœmorrhoids with so many dangerous chronic diseases, and the salutary use of internal and external remedies belonging to the class of nervina, when aided by slight digestives and a proper mental and physical regimen. Though the diseases of the spinal marrow, after being so long neglected by the profession, have become lately a hobby with some distinguished practitioners, especially in Germany, they may however be considered to a much larger extent than the profession is still aware of, as the original cause of many serious and especially chronic diseases. Hypochondria, hysteria, diabetes, fistula ani, and similar important diseases in the abdominal organs, may depend upon the morbid innervation of these respective organs from small diseased places of the spinal marrow, and the nerves originating from them, so that very small distances in the spine may decide on the formation of one, in preference to another of the diseases mentioned, and these may therefore be also most easily and quickly remedied, by a minute reference to the origin of the nerves belonging to the diseased organs, and to Charles Bell's great discovery regarding the different origin of the nerves of sensation and of motion.

consumption, dropsy, paralysis, &c., from inanition, with or without the reappearance of the habitual hæmorrhoidal or menstrual flux, so long desired; while on the contrary, in similar cases, patients have easily been restored, by relying only upon general principles and indications, without particular regard to the reappearance or non-appearance of the former symptom, the habitual morbid evacuation, which, in nine times out of ten, is suppressed merely from debility, or from sympathetical causes, to the benefit rather than to the injury of the patient, until the removal of the true cause admits their spontaneous, and only then also, salutary reappearance. In several diseases such habitual morbid secretions will, therefore, be observed to continue and to increase considerably, and, nevertheless, the health not be restored, but rather still more seriously injured, until the increased morbid secretion is again reduced to its former degree; and this frequently is done best by such remedies as in healthy persons or in other diseases, would produce the same. As we have seen, these facts belong to the most prominent pillars on which the author of homœopathia has founded and constructed his maxim, similia similibus curantur; they readily dazzle the eyes of many, who are easily misled by their want of judgment and practical talent. Indeed, the statement being correct, that the same remedies which in many cases contribute to increase a secretion, are effectual in checking it when superabundant, was too striking not to be used in support of a doctrine, which even in its few truths relies solely upon statements or merely palpable facts, and is advocated by those only, who, ignorant of sound physiological and pathogenetical principles, depend only on phenomena and care not to investigate their various causes. The old proverb, "omne simile claudicat," which is true of homœopathia in general, is particularly applicable in these cases. On a nearer examination they prove just the contrary to what they were intended to prove, viz. that a mere reliance on symptoms is delusive, whereas on the contrary, the conditions under which these phenomena generally appear, prove to be accessory effects only of the rational treatment, which operated indirectly or rather apparently upon the symptom, being however directed to counteract directly the cause only.—Should these cases offer such positive arguments for the correctness of the homœopathic fundamental maxim, similia similibus curantur, we should find no case totally at variance with it, and much less would it be pregnant with the many absurdities which

we have already quoted, and which we shall more fully mention hereafter. The fact that the same drugs which in most cases aggravated a disease, by increasing a superabundant secretion, check and cure the same in a few similar cases, proves conclusively, that the latter cases must depend upon acceossry or unknown causes, or more properly upon such as are opposite to those of the former. It is a bad rule that will not work both ways, and an old but always true saying, "circumstances alter the case." Nobody, for instance, will assert that water must be the best material for preserving fire, because in some instances in which it became decomposed by the heated substances, the violence of the flames was exceedingly increased by it!

Death, by external violence or poison excepted, the rational physician does not acknowledge the unconditional and absolute action of any treatment, or of any specific remedy: he uses the same remedies in cases apparently different, and different remedies in cases apparently identical or similar; his only intention is, and must always be, to prescribe *the same* treatment, where he has reason to presume *the same* causes. In the cases before us he cannot therefore admit, either the absolute antipathic, or much less the homœopathic property of the drug, as directly restraining the profuse morbid secretion, but must believe that it became restricted by the consecutory and beneficial effect of the rational treatment upon the vital powers in general, which could not suffer the cause of the symptoms longer to prevail; or that it was the contemporaneous specific action of the drug upon the affected secretory organ, promoting the same end. This will be the more evident in observing, that it is not sufficient only to reduce the superabundant morbid secretion to its former *quantity*, but also to its former *quality*, and that only when this takes place, we may confidently hope that the vital functions of the whole body and of the diseased secretory organ are in the best way of recovery. Every attentive practitioner will, for instance, often observe, that as a very abundant perspiration is a symptom of many acute fevers and of other diseases; the former belong mostly to the class of bilious remittent or typhus fevers, which, if they do not originate from a marsh or another miasma, or from contagion, frequently arise from checked perspiration, and commence from the neglect or illtreatment of the slight catarrhal or rheumatic affections, which they present in the beginning. Unless important organs are so affected as to require

particular care, these fevers and the excessive perspiration will be safely removed, only when, by a judicious diaphoretic treatment with ammonia, camphor and similar diffusible sudorifics, the quantity and quality of the perspiration are altered. The profession uses, particularly in such cases, the term "critical evacuation," under the erroneous impression that the matter perspired, being offensive and chemically different from what it was before, during the state termed "crude," is the cause of the disease, while, however, it is merely the consequence of the rebeginning healthy state of the before suppressed or morbidly altered secretory functions and normal nervous actions in the skin, and other organs sympathetically connected with it. With similar views the celebrated German physician, Lentin, stated, about forty years ago, (and we have often found it correct), that many severe and obstinate chronic diseases arise only from the sudden suppression of an offensive habitual perspiration of the feet, and that the disease is with difficulty removed by any remedy, not even by those which abundantly increase the perspiration of the feet, unless its original habitual offensiveness becomes restored, which he thinks is generally very difficult. Professor J. J. Albers, at Bonn, in his able treatise on ulcers of the intestines, (Ueber Darmgeshwuere, 1831), ascribes some cases of dothienteritis, and its common fatal termination by abdominal consumption, to the same cause.

From the oldest ages down to the present time, few prejudices have been retained so firmly as this, that the cure of old natural ulcers or artificial issues may be very injurious. The former are often produced by nature, the latter by art, for real allopathic purposes, so much condemned by Hahnemann, though it is justly considered in medicine, as in all occurrences of common life, fortunate to acquire for a greater evil or inconvenience, a relatively smaller one. Intimately connected, by their long continuance, with the whole human economy, their inconsiderate removal by means which render the individual still more sickly, such as the constant use of purgatives, antidyscrasics, &c. with a view to remove a virulent matter, with or without the topical application of astringents, desiccatives, or similar remedies, must prove detrimental, either directly, because they check a process which habit has rendered indispensable for tolerable good health, or indirectly, by reducing the vital energy to such a degree, that it can no longer continue this process at a distance from important organs, where it

was less injurious, and which, therefore, now occurs in a more important part. The chronic ulcer is certainly a very important disease, which should be *cured*, if possible, but not merely *suppressed*. The issue may be salutary in many serious diseases which are not as easily cured by any other remedy; but the presumed necessity of maintaining it for many years, or for life, is very inconvenient and mostly imaginary. During some severe diseases, and under the injurious influence of other causes, which impair the vital energy, natural as well as artificial ulcers of long standing, frequently heal by themselves, even with the greatest care taken to keep them open. The exertions to reproduce them, will prove beneficial, only if the cause of the new accessory disease is removed, without affecting the state of things which prevailed before. But by successfully counteracting both causes at once, the disappearance of an old ulcer, may it have existed ever so long, will, on the contrary be beneficial.

Hahnemann's assertion, in his Organon, and in his work on chronic diseases, that before his time, the profession had treated all chronic eruptions and syphilitic local affections by external remedies only, is one of his many falsehoods, and is contradicted by himself, in censuring the allopathic illtreatment of such diseases by large doses of medicines. The history of practical medicine sadly proves, that up to the last few years, when it became the fashion of many physicians to set at stake human life and health by abstaining from all internal remedies in constitutional diseases,* it was considered almost a crime to apply external remedies in such cases; internal medicines only were used, and in many cases under the vague name of specifics, blood-purifyers, &c., they ruined likewise the constitutions of many thousands, without any, or with only apparent relief.

We may also presume, with great propriety, that the different species and varieties of many diseases belonging to one class, though presenting to our senses such different figures and shapes, as, for instance, the great number of exanthematic diseases, sometimes depend upon the same cause, modified only by insignificant

* Mercury, for instance, still so indispensable for the radical cure of all syphilitic diseases, is now so much decried in these complaints by the same physicians who prescribe calomel by tea-spoon-fuls in diseases, where it is of more injury than good, that even laymen make it now generally, the first condition of an ansyphilitic treatment, not to prescribe for them any mercury; a mode which, when physicians comply with, from whatever reasons, will be deplored, sooner or later, by the foolish patient, as we know such cases, neglected in a similar manner by homœopathists.

individual circumstances, and that, therefore, such minute distinctions, as the profession is indebted for to the researches of Bateman, Alibert and others, are more interesting to the natural history of exanthematic diseases in general, than they will ever be of service to an equally minute medical treatment.

In all those cases, therefore, where diseases arise from a suppressed habitual morbid secretion, or from a similar affection, to be considered not entirely local, be it a single ulcer, or a chronic cutaneous disease, like herpes, impetigo, &c., a rational method of treatment resorting to the causes, and regarding the symptoms as less important, will succeed best. In conformity with the laws of animal life, the proper object of the profession is to reestablish the disturbed equilibrium, or the correlativeness of the two factors primarily constituting all organised life, with particular regard to the extensive as well as intensive energy of all vital actions, and also to the great variety of the living chemical processes established in the different systems, organs and parts. If this can be properly effected, the patient will then recover entirely, even without the return of his former habitual morbid secretion; but if the relative proportion of the two factors, their mutual correlation, and the particular living chemical processes resulting therefrom, are only partly and imperfectly re-established, similar to the former state of a merely relative health, then the patient may likewise recover, but only to that degree of relative health, which admits of, or even indispensably requires, the recommencement and continuance of the accustomed morbid secretion.

Among similar prejudices of the profession, existing before Hahnemann, and particularly entertained by him, we may place the erroneous conception, that a new disease may cure an old one: as, for instance, that an intermittent fever may, by succeeding some inveterate chronic diseases, cure them. This appears as false as the assertion, that a strong light extinguishes a fainter one, because the latter becomes invisible; or, that a greater vice may cure one of less importance, because the greater one either implies the latter, or destroys the propensity or power of committing it. If the former is greater, but of another kind, the consequences of both will be still observable, provided that they do not combine in a third—As allopathists, we adhere to the old orthodox opinion, that the proper antipathic remedy, reason, applied in

time to the additional vice will radically cure the new and the old vice also: whereas homœopathia, if consistent, would sanction the abominable opinion, that one vice could only be cured by another similar one committed in addition, as the best means to extinguish the first: though, according to the lately published "great truth" of Hahnemann, the only cause of all human misery, physical, mental and moral, and of course also of all human vices, being *the itch*, homœopathists may now prescribe a less disgraceful antipsoric.—According to an enlightened pathogeny, no disease can really *cure* another: if it appear to do so in some cases, the reason is, that every disease, being manifested by a *definite form*, materially depending upon its causes, the new form essentially belonging to the succeeding disease and its greater disturbances of the animal economy, be it produced by a contagion, a miasma, or any other cause, cannot admit the continuance of the old form. Two diseases combined with each other in a third disease and its proper, mostly hybrid form, will therefore also vanish together by a proper rational treatment, removing the causes belonging to both of them. And this will also happen in those cases, where the weaker disease became suppressed only while the stronger one prevailed; but then the former will re-appear and continue its proper developement and course after the latter has disappeared.—Hahnemann favours the opinion, that two or more different diseases may coexist separately, or also be combined together in a third: nevertheless he forbids his followers to attend, at the same time, to more than one disease, or to apply any compound medicine. The logical acuteness of Dr. Hering and his brethren may notice this opinion, as another argument of their void assertion, that "Hahnemann was the first physician who recognized "it as indispensable in every disease to regard man as a whole."

Hahnemann says more consistently, somewhere in his Organon or in his Materia Medica, that no substance, and of course no drug, is absolutely simple. We would ask, if a homœopathic drug, consisting according to this suggestion, of two or more constituent parts, must necessarily act upon twice as many or more symptoms, and if Hahnemann admits also the coexistence of two or more diseases combined together in a third, presenting of course, symptoms likewise different from both; what reasonable objection can he make to remove them altogether, by combining two or more

drugs in order to make of them also a third, suitable to the case before him; since the drug thus becomes only a little more compound than each of them was before? No person can reasonably object to the terms of the different drugs, which if added to the principal drug, refer to additional ends intended by them, such as "adjuvants, corrigents," &c. Hahnemann ridicules these old professional terms, because, as he expressly says, he considers it as an additional proof of the ignorance of all allopathists in regard to the diagnosis of the disease, and to the knowledge of the qualities of the simple drugs. We admit that in the homœopathic experiments for ascertaining the proper qualities of drugs, every one must be tried separately, but we should think, that the bedside of the patient is for no physician, and much less for homœopathists, the proper place to institute experiments with their developed drug-virtues, but that here, they should apply them according to the previous minute knowledge of all disease-and-drug-symptoms, whenever it may be necessary to consider two or more natural diseases combined together. The profession has lately become much opposed to compound prescriptions, but wrongly, since if one cause is the principal, or if it has taken the lead of the prominent morbid process, other ones might nevertheless coexist, which, though subordinate in their character to the former, have an essential influence on its development and course, and can therefore be properly counteracted only by additional drugs. Simple prescriptions, it is true, are generally the criterion of a well educated and judicious physician, as they prove, that he is not anxious to consider, by a motley mixture of many drugs, every slight symptom separately, but that he possesses a clear conception of the whole disease, and has formed a concise plan of treatment. But the first and principal aim of the physician being to cure the patient, in the safest and quickest manner, and this end being seldom attainable by the simple drug, on account of many simultaneous sympathetical affections, the simplicity of prescriptions, so much overvalued at present by mere fashion, should never interfere in the least with his duties. In general the reasons for substituting one drug of a certain class for another of the same, are important, though also opposed to the tenets of homœopathia. According to the laws of the living organization, and of the human body particularly, all substances, especially those acting as artificial stimulants, lose the property of affecting the incitability and of generating a reaction, in direct proportion to the time of its

continued definite quantity, however imperceptible it may often be to our narrowly confined senses. If therefore there are several drugs similar in their constituent parts and in their action as remedies, and the judicious physician has special reasons for not increasing the dose of one of them, when it refuses service after some time has elapsed, he may often employ another with success, and in doses comparatively much smaller than the former was used.

The true cause of this fact will be explained, satisfactorily only when future chemical investigations shall prove it to depend upon more or less trifling differences in the proportion of the constituent parts of both; perhaps, upon a different electro-magnetical tension. A materia medica, embracing only a few of the most effectual remedies of a whole class is therefore very defective, and this defect increases in relation to certain compositions of drugs, which experience has proved to be more effectual in particular cases, than the simple drugs of which they consist. The wise laws of a strict medical police, and the intelligent framers of a good pharmacopœia, are, therefore, not over-hasty in declaring a simple drug or a compound medicine as obsolete, but insist, for the benefit of the profession and the public, that the pocket of the apothecary should suffer by his keeping on hand a greater variety of drugs and medicines than is commonly required, rather than to lose the means of affording relief to a patient on account of the defectiveness of his stock.—All these considerations are beneath the elevated mind of the faithful homœopathist, who trusts with implicit confidence to his valuable pocket-drug-store—his fancied arsenal against the contents of Pandora's box!—It is difficult to account for Hahnemann's great objection to all compound medicines, except by the greater difficulties which his monstrous symptomatology must have presented to him in minutely adapting his method to complicated cases, and therefore also to compound medicines. We may ascribe this also to his anxious desire to complete a charlatanism quite new, and of his own invention, in prescribing simple drugs, which he laid open to the eyes of the public, and the credit of which he endeavoured to strengthen and to extol by delusive experiments and flat treatises, whilst all other quacks have hitherto tried to involve their all-curing specifics in mystery by numerous combinations of drugs.

Hahnemann speaks in many places of his works of the *indirect* and *direct* medical treatment, considering the former as substi-

tuting one disease for another, and as the only one hitherto pursued by the physicians of all schools, and claiming the latter as a never-failing radical mode of cure for his homœopathic method. Though his distinction of a direct and indirect treatment, if taken in its proper sense, is just, it must be evident to every one, that even admitting homœopathia to be correct, according to its avowed reliance on symptoms merely, without reference to any causes, no medical method could claim with less propriety to be a direct one than this;—even as a system of criminal jurisprudence which refers only to the similarity of cases, without any regard to the moral imputability, to the motives, and to the many important circumstances which may aggravate, mitigate, or annul a punishment, could not be called a direct, just and reasonable one.—As we have alluded to above, in speaking of the symptomatic treatment, the greatest source of error in medical practice, which has hitherto arrested its advancement, and will ever do so if not properly understood, is, that the immediate consequences of two totally different or even opposite modes of treatment in similar cases, are not only sometimes alike, but even that the wrong one is often for some time after followed by an apparently brilliant success. This is one of the principal reasons why, in all ages, many intelligent men have lost all confidence in the medical profession; that it has been, and still is, the object of ridicule and contempt, and that physicians often leave the choice of their treatment rather to mere chance, than to rational inductions, after they have witnessed in large hospitals, as well as in the lecture-rooms of celebrated professors, the most opposite modes of treatment, equally recommended by each party, as the only ones for a safe and quick cure. Thus any new or old system or method of practice, invented or compounded by an adventurous professor, especially if supported by his learning, eloquence and rank, frequently becomes fashionable among the profession, and causing more or less injury to the public, offers to the druggist a golden or an iron age.

> Blest he! who sees without surprise,
> The various systems fall and rise,
> As shifts the fickle gale;
> While all their utmost force exert
> To wound the foe's unguarded part,
> And all alike prevail.—*Blacklock.*

Should the success of a medical treatment really be the same, whatever mode or fashion is adopted; and should its provisions be

really so scanty as to leave this remarkable problem unsolved; then, every honest man, who has devoted his life to medical practice from humanity and scientific interest, deserves commiseration, and those who have unfortunately chosen this mode of gaining their living, are excusable for adopting any mode of practice, be it even the innocent homœopathic. But it is not so; not only the principles of rational medicine itself, but every well educated and impartial practitioner, provided his practical career was long and extensive enough for instituting minute philosophical observations, can easily solve this problem, by properly explaining the great differences, frequently obvious in the consequences of a direct or rational, and an indirect or merely symptomatical treatment, though many favourable circumstances, not dependant on the control of the physician, frequently frustrate the former, or compensate for the bad consequences of the latter, and thus contribute to perpetuate the errors and mistakes of the healing art. The profession has hitherto noticed this great difference only in a few chronic diseases, confirming the important truth, that by an improper treatment the disease may be apparently cured, while it is materially increased, so as to reappear more destructive and incurable after an indefinite length of time. Thus, for instance, if a constitutional syphilitic ulcer be suddenly removed, merely by the external application of lead-water or some other astringent, (the general course of ignorant quacks,) the experienced physician will ascribe the subsequent eruption of constutional syphilis, with all its horrid features, be it ever so long after the first attack, to the previous ill-treatment; or if an intermittent fever be removed by the use of many ounces of powdered bark, or by arsenic, and after some months or even years a dangerous liver complaint, colliquative diarrhœa, dropsy, consumption, &c. follow, he will unquestionably ascribe these diseases to the previous imprudent method. But should a patient, suffering from a severe attack of hœmoptysis, or a similar disease, be temporarily relieved by repeated large bleedings, leeches, calomel, cathartics, &c., however little these were required, and however much a contrary mode of treatment was necessary; and should he, after months or years, without any remarkable cause, become affected by dropsy of the chest, pulmonary consumption, or some other dangerous chronic disease, the doctor will ascribe these calamities to some fictitious or real accident, rather than to his previous injudicious illtreatment; nay!

should he reflect upon the old disease and admit its influence in the present hopeless case, he will rather reproach himself secretly for not having sufficiently followed, in the former disease, the prescriptions of modern practice, for not having bled, leeched, purged, &c., enough to subdue the inflammation of the lungs, the heart, &c. In large hospitals, as the patients are dismissed after their disease has been temporarily removed in a similar inconsiderate manner, and as on a renewed attack, they seldom return to the same institution and physician, the recurrence of the former disease, or of another, is observed less frequently than in private practice; and in the annual hospital reports, hundreds are therefore numbered among those radically cured, who afterwards died of a severe relapse, or of another disease, or also continue to live in a feeble state of health, frequently caused merely by neglect, or the strict adherence to a fashionable treatment. Thus these public institutions, which, by their many and prominent advantages over private practice, could largely contribute to the improvement of medical practice, are frequently the very hot-houses of a partial and rude method, which becomes the fashion of the age, by the renown of the celebrated professor and the many students attending the eloquent lectures and the treatment of the hospital autocrat.

We have already tried to explain, that all organized life must be considered as the product of two factors, and perfect or absolute health as the harmonious and energetic reciprocal action of all the integral parts of the living individual, &c. Under this ideal, which seldom or perhaps never exists, are ranged all the various states, which, more or less approaching it, are comprised under the conceptions of *relatively* or tolerably good health. Both are founded upon an equilibrium in the actions of the said parts, the latter, however, with less intense vital energy (Wirkungsvermoegen,) as originally communicated to every individual by his relatively healthy parents and preserved by his prudent life. It is evident that not only a great variety of equilibriums can exist, all of which depend upon the proportionate quantity on both sides, and admit a certain degree of vital energy, but also, that the lower degrees of this vital energy cannot resist so effectually certain injurious influences, which would not have affected persons enjoying a higher degree of vital equilibrium with its more intensive energy; a state which is termed, general morbid disposition, (*allgemeine Krankheits-anlage,*) and generally arises after an indirect

treatment from a simultaneous latent and slumbering focus of a morbid reaction. We may compare this with a pair of scales; but with this difference, that the scales will present the equilibrium with or without any weight on them, but the vital equilibrium must always contain a sufficient quantity of weight and its counterbalance, to preserve the degree of vital energy, indispensable for the proper resistance to external injuries, and for the continued feelings of psychical and physical comfort. It is also evident that though in weighing a precious substance, the disturbed equilibrium may be restored in two modes, it is nevertheless highly important to the owner, that it is done, not by taking off from this precious substance on the one side, but by adding, if possible, to the weight on the other. In order to explain this important topic of an indirect and direct treatment more clearly, let us imagine two poor men, similar in age, health, and in all and every other respect. A thousand dollars in small coin is given to both, provided they will carry it home with them. The day is warm, and after they have proceeded half-way, both drop down exhausted. Two spectators now approach, anxious to give them aid: one, inconsiderately takes off the load of money from one of them, while the other benefactor judiciously tries to restore the second sufferer, merely by food, drink, &c., and advises him to proceed on his way slowly. An idle spectator, not knowing the particulars, will consider the aid administered to the former much more effectual, when he perceives him jumping up with ease, while the latter creeps home slowly. The final result of this adventure is, that the one remains poor, whilst the other becomes wealthy. We will now ask: whether the *indirect* treatment of the former, though apparently direct, was not irrational, in comparison with the *direct*, though seemingly indirect treatment of the latter? In some situations both might have needed the removal of the burthen, or the sacrifice of the money, for the preservation of their lives, and then, of course, the aid would have been direct in both; but as the principal object failed, it is only *relatively* direct, and no reasonable man would advocate this method, unless it was urgently required, or the *absolute* direct aid, if possible, had first been tried. We do not assert that the instance given is a direct parallel case, "omne simile claudicat," though it is not inferior to many similar popular explanations made by Hahnemann.—It may, however, be obvious, that, for instance, in many diseases producing a diminished vital reaction of the

nervous system, and a simultaneously, but only relatively, increased reaction of the sanguineous system, two modes of treatment are possible; one of which tends to restore *indirectly* the disturbed equilibrium by diminishing the relative plethora or orgasmus of the blood, and the other, the rational *direct* treatment, endeavours to restore the impaired normal nervous reaction. The latter is still more rational in regard to its later consequences, for if the relatively increased quantity of blood is diminished, two defects are substituted for one, viz: the totality of the individual vital energy is reduced to a lower degree, and probably the original disproportion will soon exist in a greater degree, by the loss of the living fluid which contributes also so much to support the vital actions of the nervous system. Mutatis mutandis, the same will be the case if a predominant cause excites the nervous system, especially in its central parts, and where the vital reaction of the irritable or sanguineous system is simultaneously, but likewise only relatively, suppressed; with this difference only, that, whereas rational medicine admits the existence of no substance the primary effect of which is directly anodyne, although its after-action may be so, therefore also, in all cases where the primary exciting effect of anodynes is to be apprehended, the reaction of the sanguineous system must be reduced before they are applied. Farther, as the nervous system, in this instance, like the vascular system in the first instance, is the centre of a morbid excitement, it will draw for a length of time the nourishment for its morbid reaction from the blood, if this is not checked by judicious depletion. The strictest antiphlogistic method must therefore be considered a direct treatment, in all those cases, where over-excitement, a tendency to plastic formations, &c., exists in both these principal systems of the human body; and many cases also happen, which are so very urgent as not to allow time for direct interference, but only for indirect treatment. It is also true, that even if no imminent danger exists, the particular *form* of a disease sometimes does not admit the direct treatment, until such a form is changed by an indirect one into another form, known by experience to be a more accessible or tractable one; though these cases are less frequent than many physicians believe. We mention these brief outlines of a rational, physiological medicine, merely to enable the general reader to explain for himself, why of two opposite modes of medical treatment, the wrong one may succeed, from circumstances beyond the control of the physician, or,

as is generally the case, appears only to have succeeded in its immediate consequences, until when after the lapse of some time the patient becomes undeceived. The reader also may judge for himself, whether such shallow reasoning as homœopathia generally, and particularly its maxim, similia similibus curantur, presents, can ever be the leading principle of an art, which justly claims to rest on the minutest philosophical researches, and on the most unprejudiced and faithful experiences.

Though, with respect to the profession at large there is, as we have seen, some truth in Hahnemann's assertion, that no sound conception of the mode in which medicines operate has hitherto existed, still this is by no means applicable to those distinguished physicians of all ages, who have proved by their practice and writings, that they could well account for their rational directions, and that true talents will always elevate men above the standard of their profession, and free them from the fetters of confining tenets. Hahnemann justly censures also in his works, that in the text-books on practical medicine, drugs which produce a totally different and often an opposite effect, are recommended by the highest authorities for one and the same disease; and vice versa, that one and the same drug is recommended, in the text-books on Materia Medica, for different and even opposite maladies. But the conclusions which he draws from these facts in favor of his doctrine are false, and the contrary of his assertions will be evidently as true, by proving, as we have attempted, the facts quoted, to arise from the want or disregard of general principles, and from overvaluing the similarity of symptoms which frequently depend on very different or even opposite causes. This however does not imply the indirect admission of the false conception, that one cause must always have different effects, and vice versa; but all causes of diseases being a compound of the vital reaction and the external agents, the immensely multiplied reactions of all parts constituting the organized living body, varied also in every individual, and by the innumerable circumstances under which he at any moment exists, our senses cannot observe minutely and distinguish the immense variety of the effects and all their deeper or lighter shades, and that therefore, the identity or mere similarity which experience presents to us, must be exceedingly delusive, unless we refer chiefly to the more or less prominent causes. It is evident also that, as Hahnemann solely refers to the similarity between the symptoms of the drug-sickness

and those of the natural disease, and makes the treatment of all diseases to depend on this similarity; he believes either that an ounce of bark or an atom of arsenic, &c., is equivalent to all the influences which procreate the natural diseases, where the virtues of bark, arsenic, &c., are remedies, or admits that similar effects may arise from two causes quite dissimilar, and widely different in their power.

Hahnemann's repeated reproaches against the profession for imitating the salutary proceedings of nature in curing diseases, are worthy of his foolish conceptions of the vital powers of nature, already frequently quoted. Though we are far from invoking the vis medicatrix naturæ, or the healing power of nature, according to the present mode of many, as a deus ex machina, in cases of necessity,* still we would wish that his reproaches were true, and that physicians were really guilty of minutely listening to the operations of nature, in order to learn, by what simple means and processes she attains great ends; and how, when left undisturbed, she frequently cures diseases, which would never have prevailed so extensively, if mankind had never strayed from her simple and true dictates. Hahnemann was well aware, that all his whimsical suggestions in regard to the developed virtues of drug-atoms, would not be adopted for a moment, unless he boldly claimed for them an always absolute and unconditional power, and no one but he could deny, that

* Putting out of view all teleological and metaphysical reflections about the end and object of the existence of mortal beings, which we devotedly believe to be the greatest happiness imaginable of every individual; the tendency of nature appears, to the naturalist and physician, directed to the preservation of the whole species of living beings, rather than to that of its individuals. Always acting on fixed, eternal laws, nature will contribute to the destruction of one individual as well as to the preservation of another, leaving to the human intellect one of its principal antitheses of reflection, viz. Providence and absolute necessity.—The life of the tender fœtus is protected in the same moment and by the same law of nature by which another individual perishes; and the decrepid old man, tired of his long career, is reserved from imminent danger by the same operation of nature, as that by which the youth fades prematurely away, in the prime of his cheerful life, by an inflammation of the heart, consumption, etc. The same electricity, bursting forth in a thunder-storm, kills and calls into existence thousands of beings at the same moment.

> "Res quæque suo ritu procedit, et omnes
> "Fœdere naturæ certo discrimine servant." LUCR.

We are therefore not justified in terming the same power either healing or destroying, though the physician should generally attend rather to the destructive than to the healing power of nature; since the former prevails more prominently in all diseases than the latter, which, in its integrity, would, violent assaults excepted, never be obliged to cure a disease, because it would always prevent it. This however should never exempt him from minutely observing, when the healing direction of nature is to be supported only by a cautious active treatment, or as generally might then be more advisable, by the removal of all interference of the art.

those are the most blessed priests of the healing art, who devotedly obey the voice of nature and her laws. But Hahnemann's reproaches in regard to the treatment hitherto pursued by the mass of the profession, are but too true, if we regard only the facts, leaving his explanations unnoticed. The history of medicine teaches that the profession has either been in favor of locating the proximate cause of all diseases in some one of the three principal systems of the human body, viz. the sensitive, irritable and reproductive, or of adopting merely local derangements. But few distinguished men followed the example of a Sydenham, Fried. Hoffman, Ernst Stahl, &c., in being mindful that nature, throughout her vast empire, presents in her admirable simplicity the greatest varieties and modifications of one and the same power, that the greatest functional changes are frequently produced by the slightest shades in the formation of the individual parts, and that the results of our directions will prove auspicious in the same proportion as we apply general principles to individual cases. By neglecting this philosophical scrutiny and ratiocination, indispensable to the promotion of the rational healing art, it remained for ages a more or less stationary empiricism, varying only in this, that when a sufficient number had fallen victims to one method, another was adopted, and carried again to the utmost extreme like the former, until the cycle of the different modes at the disposal of the profession had been completed, and one of the old irrational modes of treatment was recommenced.

Thus we have seen, in our times, patients of Brownists die apopletic, evidently in consequence of large doses of stimulants, while the doctor regretted that the premature death of his patient, which of course was considered accidental, did not allow him time for the application of still more powerful stimulants. We have seen antiphlogists repeatedly bleed their patients as long as blood would flow from the vein, and then death, visibly promoted by inanition and exhaustion, was attributed to the feverish excitement, which in the doctor's opinion was not enough abated, or to the imaginary violent inflammation, which was not sufficiently checked by the lancet, leeches, cupping, &c.; he would have wished to revive the patient only to renew the exhibition of his professional consistency. Who could feel happier, who more satisfied with the correct acuteness of his diagnosis, when even the post mortem examination palpably showed inflammation or one of its common issues? That

these corpora delicti might have been *produced* by such a nonsensical mode of treatment, remained entirely out of the question. We have seen gastricists torment their patients with emetics, cathartics, calomel, salts, &c., until they expired, and then the intelligent doctor, in addition to the many bilious evacuations during lifetime, almost always in such cases the artificial product of the illtreatment, still referred to the thick yellowish coat on the tongue, to the yellow hue of the corpse, &c., as mathematical proofs to him, that death only ensued because the patient had not been seen sufficiently early, or had not lived long enough, to swallow still larger doses of calomel, jalap, castor oil, &c.

Some think themselves acting very prudently, if ignorant of the philosophical principles of the healing art, they try two opposite methods in succession, falsely imagining that they can by such a double rude empiricism best attain the desired end; if, for instance, during an acute fever, the doctor is unsuccessful in subduing the excitement by all the means of his antiphlogistic armory, he turns to the other extreme, and fancying to revive the prostrated vital forces, prescribes strong infusions of valerian, decoctions of bark, ether, opium, cordials, &c. If the patient grows worse and dies, the doctor will be satisfied, having offered to the patient, in his opinion the best chance to escape from death, by opening for him the two great highways of the profession for the salvation of their patients; if he fortunately recovers, the brilliant success will be ascribed to the method now best liked by the physician; the next patient will have to suffer by this method, and may not be lucky enough to escape.

Some excuse their transition from one extreme to the other, by pretending that the character of all diseases becomes altered by atmospheric or telluric changes, every ten or more years. Who would not admit the existence of atmospheric influences, as seen in epidemics, &c.? but these great changes have by no means been contemporaneously ascertained by meteorological observations, nor confirmed by those physicians, who have practised under the same external conditions, and have remained faithful to their principles.

All these doctors considered their method to be the best, all ridiculed and pitied their opponents, because, in spite of their murderous empiricism, some of their patients either recovered by their athletic constitution, aided by occurrences fortunately beyond the control of the doctor, or *seemed* at least to be radically cured, until after

some time a serious relapse or another dangerous disease followed. It is very natural that in many cases in which a disease threatened to be long and dangerous, and was checked in the beginning by the judicious exertions of the physicians, his skilful prevention remains unnoticed by the patient and his relatives, who, in consequence of this easy and sudden recovery, could not be aware of the danger from which the patient had escaped; and in fact an unprofessional men would require a very minute knowledge of the healing art, in which many doctors even are deficient, to be able to value such a case properly. The same may generally be expected, when by the prophylactic care of the judicious family physician, the members of a family enjoy for many years excellent health, when compared with other families, where the doctor has frequent opportunity for brilliant cures. It is indeed difficult to explain why, in medical practice, the talents of the physician and the superiority of his method are generally appreciated in direct proportion to the length and difficulty of the recovery, and why a patient whose good luck alone may have saved him from death, is often regarded as a splendid specimen of professional talent and care, when creeping about for months on crutches like a shadow. And much less explainable must it appear, that people still possess any confidence in the medical profession, when they observe the application of one and the same treatment under circumstances which they themselves must consider widely different. If for instance a man falls down asphyctic, whether in the severest cold of winter or in the extreme heat of summer, whether he is apparently starved or has indulged too much in food or drink, whether he appears to have previously enjoyed good health, or has been rather reduced, &c., he must be bled, and afterwards take, if possible, an emetic, &c. No one reasonably conjectures that, although by these means he may be revived for a short time, the vital powers may become soon extinguished, when they might have been restored by an opposite mode.

The manner hitherto pursued, in order to ascertain the effect of medicines, was and is still very defective, and has led to almost the same errors as those caused by Hahnemann's suggestions about the effect of simple drugs; both believing definite drugs or medicines especially adapted to definite symptoms; allopathia however is less defective, because its maxim, contraria contrariis, is far more accordant with nature than that of homœopathia, though we must add, with regret but with justice, that the former, in its practical mis-

application, has hitherto generally proved to be much more obnoxious than the latter ever will be, when faithfully pursued, if we may ascribe a positive preference to anything of merely negative worth.

We venture to say that the text-books on Materia Medica have done more injury than good to the promotion of rational medicine, by defining the positive action of drugs. It will always be so, because no systematical classification, no plan whatever adopted for a Materia Medica, can answer the requisites of rational medicine. The natural history of the different drugs and their chemical qualities excepted, which may be easily combined with botany, chemistry, &c., this doctrine should cease to exist separately, and the substance of it should be combined with general therapeutics, this philosophy of all practical medicine, so much neglected in the course of professional study; and for the same reason general therapeutics should also take the place of special therapeutics, the substance of which could be left with much greater advantage to special pathology and clinical courses. The mistakes of Materia Medica in defining absolute medical properties of drugs, and the ease of applying them as specifics, have promoted a rude empiricism, and these may be considered the causes, why the benefits which practical medicine has hitherto derived from modern chemistry, consist almost solely in a large addition to the already superabundant stock of powerful drugs, which instead of being a blessing to mankind, have frequently been in the hands of the rude empiric only so many more instruments of injury.—" Subjectum istud medicinæ " (corpus nimirum humanum) ex omnibus, quæ natura procreavit " maxime est capax remedii; sed vicissim illud remedium maxime "est obnoxium errori."—(Fr. Bacon.)

We have seen already, and shall explain more fully the manner in which Hahnemann has treated these subjects, and how little the profession can trust to the results of his experiments and to his suggestions. Should we credit some few trustworthy men among his followers, we would be indebted to homœopathia for the knowledge of some substances, now applicable to different topical diseases, which have hitherto been considered as acting only on whole systems of the human body. It however shows gross ignorance and assumption, for the author of the "Concise View" and his brethren to assert, that Hahnemann introduced as specifics into the Materia Medica, such drugs as Digitalis, Pulsatilla, Belladonna, &c.

In the same manner as Mercury was known, long before his

time, to act prominently on the lymphatic system, so we were acquainted with the effect of Digitalis upon the heart and the arteries, of opium and similar narcotics upon the nervous, of Belladonna upon the nervo-muscular irritability, etc. Could we, however, rely more confidently upon his experience at the bed-side of the patient, we should owe to him the beneficial effects of Aconitum in the genuine or plastic inflammation of the lungs, of Spongia in a similar affection of the mucous membranes and of the glands of the throat, of Pulsatilla, erroneously considered by the profession as obsolete, for some particular nervous affections of the eyes, etc. etc. all of which exert not only a beneficial influence upon the morbid disorders of a whole system, but act also specially upon the tissues of different organs. But from the following statement, which represents the manner in which he instituted his experiments with drugs, from those remarks which we shall give at the discussion of the 3d maxim, and from what we already know of his false statements about Belladonna in scarlet fever, about Camphor and Copper in Asiatic cholera, etc. we are sorry that we have only to record his failures, his fancies, and his rude empiricism.*

* Since these remarks were written, we have seen an article in the New-York Commercial Advertiser of the 7th of February, 1834, addressed "to Parents," and signed "a Citizen." It appears that this citizen had lost some children by scarlet fever, under the medical treatment of an allopathist; and believing that he himself afterward had an attack of the same disease, and was saved by the homœopathic treatment with Belladonna, he thought it his duty to direct public attention to the "ignorance and obstinacy of the profession" generally, and to the great blessings which homœopathia secures to mankind, and especially to those attacked by scarlet fever.

In whatever manner the feelings of a well educated unprofessional person may have been affected, both by extraordinary misfortune and by gratitude to the man to whom he thinks himself indebted for relief; it is utterly inconsistent with common sense as well as with moral and delicate feeling, to publish such a remarkably frantic and malicious article. We should have believed it impossible for any citizen of this country, unless he belonged to the lowest class of quacks, to disregard not only all the decorum due to the highly respected class of physicians, but to injure, in such a foolish and contemptible manner, the just feelings of those of his fellow citizens, who have been or may be so unfortunate as to lose their children or relatives by the same scourge; asserting, with the utmost and almost mathematical precision, that his own direful afflictions, and those of others also, would have been prevented by the homœopathic treatment with Belladonna. We venture to express and to vindicate the good sense and just indignation of an enlightened and abused community, in declaring, that we have never read any publication more *unbecoming* and *false* than this Address to Parents. It seems as if a red-hot homœopathist had made a tool of this infatuated citizen, and profited also by this opportunity, to direct public attention to his marvellous all-curing method, without the least regard to truth, to the respect due to the public at large, and to the profession in particular. We shall say nothing of the citizen's *own fate*, and also nothing about his brief biography of Hahnemann, as we have given above a different but true statement of it. It must, however, appear very unfair and inconsistent, that the gentlemen homœopathists of this country, who, like their master and brethren in Europe, despise the most trust-worthy literary authorities of all ages, and the experience of the greatest practitioners, hail, from ignorance or intentionally, each adventurer who enters their ranks, and take advantage of the ig-

As it is material to any one who finds particular interest in the results of physical experiments, to know in what manner they are instituted, and as it must be our principal object, to provide the

norance of the public respecting foreign medical literature, to represent men as highly distinguished physicians and authors, who are in both respects as insignificant and unknown in their respective countries as they themselves are in this. In regard to the German, French, and Italian doctors, who have adopted homœopathia, and whose names are quoted by "the citizen," as *the first* in the profession; we repeat our former remark, that they are *quite obscure* men. Hufeland excepted, *not one* of them, has any pretensions to medical talent, or is distinguished or even known in the medical literature of his own country, except, at farthest, as being a practitioner or author on homœopathia. Hufeland, who never was considered in Germany as "the patriarch of German medicine," but who was merely and still is highly respected as a distinguished author and physician, neither claimed to be, nor ever was admitted as the "leader" of the profession there. Impartial to every medical system, and upwards of 40 years editor of a valuable medical periodical, Hufeland was always more tolerant to the absurdest suggestions than a truly ingenuous man and a zealous lover of truth ought to have been. He has nevertheless *never declared in favour* of homœopathia: on the contrary, like *all* the public professors of medicine and surgery at Berlin, and in all other German universities, a few insignificant men excepted, he has only recommended that *some* of the topics of homœopathia, in regard to the maxim, "similia similibus curantur," might deserve a closer examination, since it appears to him possible, that in this way also, the profession could obtain some beneficial results, and that perhaps many discordant opinions could be reconciled by it. (See Hufeland, die Lehre von den Heilungs-objecten und ihrer Erkenntniss, oder die Jatrognomik. Ein Versuch zur Vereinigung der Aerzte, Berlin, 1829.) Hahnemann's "great truth," contained in his work on chronic diseases, was at that time not yet known to Hufeland, otherwise he probably would have given a less liberal opinion of Hahnemannism. We can assure our readers, that most of the German physicians, who felt, like ourselves, in duty bound repeatedly to try belladonna as *a preventive* against scarlet fever, because it could not do harm, even in the dose first prescribed by Hahnemann, (which is many hundred million times larger or smaller than the dose he now believes to be too strong or too weak) have declared this drug *ineffectual* as a preventive and still more so *as a remedy*. The scarlet fever still prevails in Germany, as can be ascertained from the latest German medical works and periodicals; and perhaps likewise from those causes to which we have alluded in our remarks upon the dangers of vaccination, with *greater* violence than it did before Hahnemann's insignificant discovery. Dr. Kopp also, who, as we have mentioned above, is the only German homœpathist, if we dare call him so, who has been distinguished as an author and practitioner before he examined this method, states, in regard to the use of Belladonna in scarlet fever, (on p. 326 of his work above cited,) "According to my frequent experiments I must declare it to be a "very unsafe preventive, and by no means comparable with vaccination," as Hahnemann would make all the world believe, especially at that time, when he intended to make a fortune, by using Belladonna as an arcanum. Those German physicians who have employed belladonna as a preventive, have not used it as a remedy for scarlet fever; since Hahnemann himself has recommended this drug at first, merely as a preventive of this disease and not as a remedy for it: and in later times, when he recommended it also as a remedy, he made it to depend on a very minute distinction between the scarlatina levigata and miliaris, which does not essentially exist.—No professional man of a but limited practice will acknowledge any material difference, simply between these two forms of scarlet fever; and this may also serve as a proof that Hahnemann was never engaged in any extensive practice, but has formed his conceptions by hunting for antiquated literary curiosities and by his own inventions. We would suggest that both forms of *the same* disease, with all its symptoms, dangers, etc. (although the miliaris is in the first stage less dangerous than the levigata,) appear to depend on a higher or lower degree of atmospheric electricity; as the damp atmosphere in northern Germany is less electric than the atmosphere in the northern states of America, the miliaris is more frequent there, while the levigata is more usual here: in very cold and dry winters, however, we frequently met with the levigata in Germany. Perhaps both forms depend only on the predominant positive or negative atmospheric electricity, producing an effect upon the human body, distantly similar to Lichtenberg's figures of both electricities.—It is very singular that homœopath-

impartial reader of these pages with all the means necessary to judge for himself, what confidence might be reasonably placed in the correctness of Hahnemann's experiments, and still more in all

ists speak at all of scarlet fever, since, as we have seen, Hahnemann forbids them to give a name to a disease which is similar to one of the older schools; and consistently, instead of scarlatina levigata, and purpura miliaris, they should speak only of an aconite and a belladonna-sickness.---Dr. Kopp, the infatuated admirer of Hahnemann's genius, who has used Belladonna in scarlet fever, says, on page 327. l. c. where he ridicules Hahnemann's fanciful distinction just mentioned:—"I frequently treated "patients suffering from scarlatina according to the homœopathic method, with bella- "donna, mercury, etc. and in general I have not noticed unfavourable results. Severe "cases, and those which were dangerous, have not been arrested by it, and required "chlorine in large doses, cold fomentations to the head, sinapisms, etc."—Future times will prove still more, that the cure of scarlet fever depends upon a minute rational treatment, and upon a regime different from that still pursued in many countries by highly obnoxious popular prejudices, rather than upon any *specific*, and least of all, upon an infinite atom of belladonna; though this powerful drug, like all others, may prove beneficial in the rational treatment of scarlet fever, under peculiar circumstances, which prescribe the most rigorous antiphlogistic as well as the quite opposite treatment, particularly in its different stages.---The well known experiments on which this accidental discovery of Hahnemann rests, deserve particular notice, in proving his inability to institute minute and impartial experiments, and much less to draw sound conclusions from them. The berries of belladonna are by no means *the only* substance which produces in healthy persons an eruption on the skin, very remotely similar to scarlet fever; many other narcotic plants, especially if taken in quantities sufficiently large to act as poisons, frequently cause the same: thus we remember a similar eruption in a whole family, poisoned by thorn-apple seeds boiled in milk, instead of the seeds of the fennel-flower, (Nigella sativa, L.) which were intended as a domestic medicine. We remember also, thirty-five years ago, a remarkable instance of a stout man, upwards of seventy years old, in whom, after taking *two* drops of laudanum for diarrhœa, an eruption appeared, similar to scarlatina levigata, only without fever, but ending, like scarlet fever, with the desiccation of the skin: and two years after, the same consequences followed, in the same man, from *one* drop of laudanum only. It is also well known, that some persons and whole families, at least in Germany, experience the same symptoms whenever they eat craw-fish or clams, and sometimes even on taking the prepared crabs-eyes, which are used as a domestic diaphoretic and anti-acid medicine. Must these and many other substances, therefore, not likewise be consistently considered as remedies for the smooth scarlet fever? How great is, moreover, often the difference between *the fruit* of a plant and its root, leaves, or other parts! the one may act in one way, the other in a different manner on the human body. De Candolle (Organographie végétale, vol. II.) states, that in every plant, the most poisonous not excepted, the endospermium and cotyledones contain no poison, but always a farinaceous substance, which may serve as wholesome nourishment for men and animals. Was Hahnemann consistent in prescribing only *the berries* of belladonna, or their juice, against scarlet fever? No! On page 11 of vol I. of his Materia Medica, he orders expressly the juice of *the whole* plant to be taken while it is in blossom; of course then without the berries, the very object of his first discovery. This is objectionable only in respect to homœopathia, which boasts of such great regard to trifles and minutiæ, since the medical virtues are contained in the herb and in the root of belladonna much more than in its berries. The root being by far the strongest, Hahnemann, in prescribing the many billionth part of one grain, appears, therefore, as usual, particularly inconsistent in prescribing to take the whole plant without the berries.---We regret particularly, that a public paper with so large a circulation, has consented to become the inhuman instrument for spreading a collection of statements so alarming, so void of truth, and so redolent with charlatanism, without such previous inquiries as we think due to the public in such cases. In fact, the impudent advertisement of a quack, persuading the public that *he alone* can cure all patients easily and quickly of a disease which has so frequently proved fatal under the most judicious treatment of the greatest physicians of all countries and ages, supporting his infallible cures, of course, by a sufficient number of public testimonials, must appear contemptible; how much more so when men abuse, under the hypocritical cloak of patriotism and modest professional philanthropy, the ignorance and

the inferences drawn from them by him and his followers, we shall give an instance of his original experiments with drugs, instituted in healthy persons in order to produce a drug-sickness.

We purposely select the experiments made with Peruvian bark, as a drug best known. (See according to Kopp l. c. p. 55, Organon §. §. 16 and 132 of the third, and § 120 of the fourth edition.) In order to excite a bark-fever, which may last for several days, the healthy person must take, in the course of one day, a mixture made of one ounce of powdered bark, with five ounces of alcohol and two pounds of water. This will be taken best before breakfast, and according to circumstances, this dose may be increased to twice, (§ 133 old edition,) or even four times as much, (§ 134 ibid.) Now we candidly ask, who can wonder that from experiments, instituted principally in this manner, only 1143 bark-symptoms are recorded in Hahnemann's materia medica, as we might confidently expect several thousand symptoms in addition to those mentioned, if all are minutely written down from the reports of a healthy person, unaccustomed to such stimuli, and intoxicated for many hours by twenty ounces of alcohol and four ounces of powdered bark; especially if this person was such a stupid, credulous and infatuated disciple, as the above mentioned Bohemian barber, or any one else, prepossessed and anxious to satisfy the tiresome cross-examinations and the absurd expectations of such a master? Our "great medical genius," who, according to the enraptured Dr. Hering, (l. c. p. 11) "now stands forth as "a conqueror" who, (l. c. p. 27) "has beaten a new path on all "sides;" and (l. c. p. 21) by "whose *careful attention to minutiæ*

folly of a distressed, infatuated man, and induce him publicly to say, exactly in the following terms, that "Samuel Hahnemann has swept away from medicine, as Isaac "Newton did from Astronomy, the huge mass of intellectual lumber that had clogged "it for centuries;" that "belladonna was, when administered according to the direc-"tion of its discoverer, a certain established sovereign cure for the scarlet fever:"—that "it has been in general use, as such, on the continent of Europe since 1811:" —that "scarlet fever has ceased to be an object of terror in these countries;" and that "in the present state of medical science, every victim by scarlet fever was a wanton sacrifice of human life to medical obstinacy, or to involuntary medical ignorance.' We wish from our heart, that all patients suffering from this dangerous disease may recover by belladonna, or by any other treatment. But what can such an impostor or infatuated simpleton, who palpably guided the pen of this "citizen," say for his defence, if, in spite of such impudence, he himself loses even his near relatives by scarlet fever when homœopathically treated?---"Where authority is from one man to "another, there the second must be ignorant and not learned and full of thoughts; "and such are, for the most part, all superstitious persons, whose belief, tied to their "teachers and traditions, are no whit controlled, either by reason or experience."---
Fr. Bacon.

" a new era has dawned upon all the natural sciences," this very man, who considers the *decillionth part of one grain of common table salt* in many cases as too strong, is pleased to call *twenty* " *ounces of alcohol, and four ounces of powdered bark, swallowed* " *in a few hours, and even before breakfast,*" as a mere nothing, and instead of calling the 1143 symptoms elicited by the cross-examination of such a person by their right name, *the utterings of an intoxicated person*, he is pleased to call them " *bark-fever symp-* " *toms,*"—"Dialectorum verba nulla sunt publica, suis utuntur," (Cicero.)—Hahnemann,who recommends for his homœopathic solutions, (see Organon § 267, and Chronic Diseases,) alcohol strong enough to ignite a piece of spunk, (which can be done only by the strongest alcohol), considers this substance as utterly indifferent, and as the least apt to change the qualities of simple drugs. This opinion, the experiments similar to those just quoted, connected with his suggestion above cited, viz. that persons become less liable to diseases in proportion to the number of different homœopathic trials made on them with simple drugs, and his theory that all chronic diseases depend mostly on itch—all these statements and assertions together may justify our inference, that according to the tenets of homœopathia, a person might constantly indulge in drinking brandy, or any other spirituous drink, without the least injury to his health. This contradicts the remark of Dr. Hering, who says on page 26 of his " Concise View," " Hahne- " mann considers all spirituous drinks as positively injurious," and demonstrates still more clearly his attempts to render thereby also his " new art of healing" as palatable as possible to the enlightened people of this country, by yielding in this manner to the prejudices of the temperance-or rather abstinence-societies, although these attempts are not required by his doctrine.* As a faithful homœopa-

* No one will consider us adverse to any measures for promoting temperance, though we are not in favour of total abstinence, and cannot see the propriety of joining a society as a particular inducement or obligation to live temperately, any more than to join other societies for exercising other virtues, which we are bound to observe from religious and moral feelings and principles. Intemperance in spirituous drinks is very detrimental both in a moral and physical point of view, and its bad consequences are generally irreparable. Those who are still doubtful of the correctness of this assertion, should seriously direct their attention to the severe lesson, which the wisdom of Providence has given them by the Asiatic cholera, since in all countries and under the most different medical treatments, very few intemperate individuals were cured. Intemperate persons also by the habitual over-excitement of their nervous system are not only unable to bear the higher degrees of heat and cold as well as temperate ones, but there exists to our knowledge, no instance where asphyctics by cold, when intoxicated, have been restored to life, whilst the contrary has often been the case with

thist, uninfluenced by other motives, he must have been aware, that unless a man feels religious and moral obligations to live temperately, as every prudent man should do, the principal checks are removed rather than increased by Hahnemann. Should any one believe our interpretation incorrect and partial, he may consider how often Dr. Hering and his homœopathic brethren assure the public of the *infallibility* of homœopathia, that he says on p. 25, a false selection of a drug *cannot do injury*; (on p. 21,) that *error is impossible, etc.*; and the same assurances are still more given by Hahnemann, for instance, in vol. iv, p. 19 of his Mat. Med. second edition, where he says, that all experience will prove to every body, that a drug selected according to his manner, "will not only "change the disease into health easily and durably, but *it will* "*never leave any one uncured*;" and in vol. iii, p. 7 of the same work, "*If all that the homœopathic doctrine promises, provided it is faith-*"*fully pursued, does not exactly take place*—then homœopathia is "considered to be lost."—If therefore, our interpretations in regard to all other assertions and directions of Hahnemann cannot be considered exaggerated, a man prone to intemperance, can now confidently expect that, if after all he should fall sick in consequence of this vice, he will be cured safely and quickly by the virtue developed from a few atoms of a drug.

With due reverence for the great effect of religious and moral principles, in preventing moral faults simply by their great intrinsic value, we must admit, that hitherto Providence has ordained both moral and physical happiness to be generally the rewards of a pious and virtuous life, while vices cause much physical unhappiness, sufferings and misery, and that this merciful order of things has unquestionably hitherto deterred many from evil habits, and especially from the source of all vices, intemperance. Should homœopathia, always so superior to the stupid and miserable vital powers of nature, shake in this case also, the belief and confidence of many, in the old order of things, it would become at least indidirectly instrumental in promoting intemperance and all other

temperate individuals, after apparent death had lasted for upwards of three days. For the same reasons professional men will find it by far more difficult, to restore men, given to drunkenness, to their health when affected by diseases, than men of sober habits. The alcohol of all spirituous drinks, entering when used in excess into the mixture of the blood, into the brain, muscles, etc., is also the only cause of the many shocking instances of self-combustion. Intemperance is a vice peculiar to man, which deprives him, by his own voluntary act, of his noblest prerogative, reason; it is therefore in itself the worst and most contemptible kind of suicide, to which it so often indirectly leads.

vices. Hahnemann and his adherents have much to answer for, as they encourage this great evil.—We cannot well boast of our great predilection for this Abracadabra of the nineteeth century, nor do we like to display our philanthropy. But, nevertheless, it may easily be imagined what grief we felt that such "a treasure," like this "new art of healing," by which, according to the hopes and expectations of Dr. Hering, (p. 29, l. c.), "future generations will be "rescued from its leaden fetters, the bitterest human misery— "disease bearing down all earthly joy, become less from year to "year, and the sweetest boon on earth—health and domestic feli- "city become the portion of growing thousands here as well as in "Germany," should not be able to compensate in a manner fully worthy of its exalted destiny, for the great injuries and inconveniences, just named, of which it is the innocent cause. We feel happy to state, that we have hit upon such a compensation, and we hope that it will not be amiss to suggest here to the "great "benefactor of mankind," and to his followers, a plan by which they can nobly and munificently atone for this evil attending their doctrine if generally adopted, and which plan is also intimately connected with their maxim, "similia similibus curantur."

The political emancipation of the coloured population, now agitating the whole civilized world, is the very field assigned to Hahnemann and his benevolent doctrine. The celebrated naturalist, professor Link, of the Berlin University, in his interesting work, "the Primitive World," (die Urwelt), considers the African as the original race of mankind, and all other men, especially the whites, as a variety of the negro, physically degenerated by one or more unknown causes; perhaps by a constitutional affection, which once generally prevailed; resembling to that by which the Leukaethiopes or Albinos become so anomalous from the whites. We do not exactly recollect by what reasons and deep learning he supports this strange opinion, though it might be noticeed, that coloured men grow much lighter when sick, and also that many instances are recorded, where white persons have become permanently black, without any material injury to their health, after a violent fit of anger, fright, or a similar mental excitement. It is also well known that by the influence of northern climates, many animals, coated with a dark skin in southern countries, turn white, without any other observable anomaly. Be this as it may, those who consider this metamorphosis of the human race to be as fanciful as

are all the arguments of the learned naturalist, on account of the great difference in the mental capacities between the white and the negros, as stated by many, may perhaps become more convinced of this important hypothesis, if they believe Hahnemann's "great truth," about the antiquity of the far-spread itch, and especially if they advert to the fact, that the mental capacities of individuals have frequently improved after recovering from a serious constitutional disease. Now it is also a fact, that lunar caustic or nitras argenti, if taken by whites, even in small allopathic doses, will cause a permanently blackish hue over the whole skin, without any particular danger. In accordance with the homœopathic maxim, similia similibus curantur, we therefore should not doubt for a moment that, if a black individual takes a homœopathic dose of lunar caustic, it might change the black skin white, as well as it turns the white skin black. Should this experiment succeed, as it probably will, (though it has, to our knowledge, not yet been tried), since the conformity of homœopathia with the laws of nature is established, it will be highly advantageous to the coloured population, especially in countries where they now live politically emancipated amongst whites, and since, probably, no law will for centuries be effectual enough to extinguish opinions and prejudices, as we may term such deeprooted impressions, so long as they are entertained by visible physical marks; and as reciprocally, every disadvantageous distinction will perpetuate the moral faults which naturally originate from such prejudices, unworthy of all truly religious and moral feeling. Every body must admit this to be extremely deserving of the noble-minded homœopathist; though under the supposition that this will be effected solely by a slightly artificial *disease*, they would be obliged, from humanity, to deviate, in *these cases only*, from their usual benevolent mode of transmuting all diseases into health. Hahnemann, who was probably himself not aware that his great discoveries would likewise benefit so large a number of healthy human beings, over such large sections of the globe, has inconsciously removed the great obstacle to its success, and confirmed by this also, what Dr. Hering emphatically predicted, when saying, on page 27, " Thus has Hahnemann beaten a new path on all " sides. His admirable observations and manifold experience have " constantly advanced the new art, created by his instrumentality, " and every year brings with it fresh proofs of his genius." The only serious objection to this unique salutary morbid process

is this; that as lunar caustic is a remedy for epilepsy, or the falling sickness, it might produce this direful disease in the white-washed negro. Hahnemann removes this fear, by suggesting in his Materia Medica, Vol. IV., that the beneficial effects of lunar caustic in epilepsy, depend not upon the silver, but the copper contained in it, and therefore declares that *copper* and not silver is the real homœopathic drug in epilepsia. Though he made, as we have seen a similar declaration with regard to Asiatic cholera, in his second edition for its infallible cure, namely, to cajeput-oil; and although no "over-refined" chemist can conceive what copper has to do with *pure* lunar caustic, the faithful homœopathists will, however, not doubt it. They will unquestionably simplify the experiment, by substituting the virtues developed from *metallic* silver, since Hahnemann prefers also the latter to the lunar caustic, and believes it to be very soluble in the stomach juice; we believe him in such instances more than on any other topic, since he was, during his whole life, a particularly good judge of metallic gold and silver, and could always metamorphose them *in succum et sanguinem*.—Should the collateral homœopathic effect of silver prove too strong in regard to the falling sickness, though a little touch of it may beneficially counteract the premature assumption of the present generation of the emancipated negro,—we would advert to the highly interesting discovery, lately made by Dr. Werneck, of Salzburg, according to which all bad consequences of poisoning by metallic substances, of course if they do not consist in organic destruction, can be cured by the proper application of electricity. Whites, with a blackish hue of the skin from lunar caustic, may therefore now expect to acquire their old white colour again, as well as negroes, who are too much affected or dissatisfied in being homœopathically white-washed, their old deep sooty one. This proposed measure would finally cost nothing, if we consider what the largest homœopathic dose is, in comparison with the allopathic one of twenty millions of pounds sterling, granted by the highminded Britons for the political emancipation of the coloured population in the British dominions. The properly developed virtue of a penny-worth of silver, would be more than sufficient for all the negroes in America. We may leave it to the distinguished arithmetical acquirements of Hahnemann and Dr. Hering, of which we have above quoted some remarkable specimens, to determine how many penny pieces will be necessary to whitewash

the whole African population; provided they would accept this benefit from their white homœopathic brethren.—Difficile est satyram non scribere!

In following our subject we must prove, even admitting for a moment the second homœopathic maxim, similia similibus curantur, to be fully correct, *in these*, that it is not only *contradicted* by Hahnemann himself and by his doctrine, but also that it is utterly impossible *in praxi*, strictly to comply with its imperative requisites. For this purpose we shall direct the attention of the indulgent reader to the following quotations from Dr. Hering's pamphlet, in addition to those quoted above from page 24.—On page 21 he says, "Nothing indeed but the symptoms are to be accepted, as "the guide to the treatment of the disease, because, in them alone, "no error is possible," and ibid. "but so much more necessary it is "that every case of disease should be completely comprehended in "all its symptoms, and with great accuracy," and on pages 21 and 22, "all the circumstances under which any complaint arises or "disappears, increases or diminishes; whether in motion or at "rest, in certain situations and postures, whether by warmth or "cold, in the open air or in the room, by light, by noises, by talk-"ing or thinking, eating or drinking, touch or pressure, emotions "of the mind or mental exertions,—all must be taken into account. "Sensations on falling asleep, during sleep and on waking, the "posture during sleep; even the dreams and the kind of them, "whether of falling, of flying, of fire, of noises, of hunger, of motion, "of seeing frightful objects, &c., all belong to the image of the "disease, and any one of which, may not unfrequently be the de-"ciding symptom," and on page 22, "regard being paid to the "patient's mental constitution and temper," &c.

Hahnemann himself urges all these conditions also as the very essence of his doctrine, in innumerable places of his writings, especially in his Organon and in his Materia Medica. Among others he says, "the condition of the mind and humor of the patient "materially decide the selection of a remedy, the choice of it de-"pending principally upon the psychical symptoms of the diseased "person." We cannot conceive how these directions could be well complied with, and how the remarks just quoted can be reconciled with the expressions of Hahnemann in many parts of his works, especially in his Organon, from § 156 to § 176, where he tries to demonstrate, in contradiction to his own and Dr. Hering's sugges-

tions, that at the bedside of the patient the homœopathist must sometimes be satisfied with *few*, and even with a *very few* characteristic symptoms. On page 225 § 158 of the Organon he says, "The small number of homœopathic symptoms, observable in the "best selected drugs, does not however impede the cure, *when these "few symptoms are of an uncommon kind, and particularly "distinctive of the disease*, (characteristic;) the cure will never- "theless be effected without particular difficulty."—After the explicit expositions of Hahnemann and his worthy disciple cited above, that *all* symptoms *collectively*, up to the *most minute*, are *indispensably* required, in order to know the true character of the case, or to form *a faithful image* of the disease, as a *true copy* of the corresponding drug-sickness, there exists no characteristic symptom, or signum pathognomonicum of the profession, for the homœopathist, as the *totality* of the symptoms in the natural disease, when compared with the *totality* of the drug-symptoms, without any superior or inferior value of one or more symptoms, constitute *the whole character* of every disease in homœopathia. We observe in all the experiments, instituted by Hahnemann with drugs on healthy persons, very few in which the drug-sickness did not present at least a hundred, and frequently many hundreds and even upwards of 1400 symptoms, among which none are particularly distinguished by him as principally characteristic of all others, or as pathognomonical; it is therefore a gross inconsistency, first to make the perfect similarity between the symptoms of the drug,-and disease-sickness minutely dependent upon one another, and to say that the salutary success of the treatment will only be secured if both exactly coincide, and to curtail and retract afterwards the same requisites. It is impossible to comprehend, how the faithful homœopathist can suffer any deduction of symptoms, without destroying the only foundation of his diagnosis, and without exposing his treatment to mere chance. Every syllable of the homœopathic symptomatology substantiates, that by the least deduction of symptoms, and of course proportionally by a larger one, the faithful homœopathic practitioner, will experience the greatest difficulties and when mistaken in his diagnosis, from the want of sufficient symptoms, will find too late that he was deprived of this his only compass on the vast ocean of all his drug- an dnatural-sicknesses. On a minute scrutiny of Hahnemann's Materia Medica, we observe that, two large catalogues of two drugs, causing upwards of a thousand symptoms each, coincide by two-

thirds, others often by seven-eighths and sometimes still more with each other.—It would be too tiresome for the reader as well as for us, to extract here side by side, this coincidence, which as we have stated, arises principally from this, that the subjective sensations and feelings of the persons, constitute by far the larger part, when compared with those symptoms, objectively obvious to the physician ; every one may compare them in the works quoted and in Hahnemann's Treatise on Chronic Diseases.—From a comparison between three homœopathic drugs and their corresponding three diseases, in order to arrive at the similarity between their symptoms, it will become evident, that if, for instance, we find one thousand symptoms belonging to the first drug, 900 to the second, and 800 to the third, 800 of which are alike in all three, that the first and second are only distinguished relatively by 200 and 100 symptoms from the third;—now if this deduction is made from the symptoms of the first and second drug, and two natural diseases before us do not offer more and other symptoms than have remained after this deduction, each of the latter must be confounded with each of the former,and thus the true diagnosis of the diseases must be impossible. Even if we admit to homœopathists the existence of pathognomonical symptoms in the sense of allopathia, it is inconsistent with their doctrine to conjecture, that *these* symptoms only should always be left, and that the others of minor value may be deducted, since they think that the latter also contribute to form the true image of the disease, and that the different expressions of the older schools, symptomata causæ, symptomata symptomatum, &c., belong to the most foolish and detrimental prejudices of allopathia. Should the adoption of characteristic symptoms be fully sufficient to point out a disease in homœopathia, Hahnemann's display of so many symptoms would be still more ridiculous, as contributing only to enlarge the symptomatology of the older schools, without the great advantages which the latter afford by their important reference to the causes.

Had Hahnemann ever consistently acknowledged the wothr of characteristic symptoms, he would have made the diagnosis more easy and certain by a particular regard to them, whether he had adopted those established as pathognomical symptoms by the minute observations of the older schools, or had suggested new ones, drawn from his pretended discoveries; he would then have classified his natural diseases, as all authors on special pathology and

therapeutics do, and by comparing the characteristic symptoms of natural diseases with those of drug-sickness, he would have prevented those great mistakes to which his followers are now exposed, it being left to their judgment what they may consider as characteristic or not. Thus, under the head of any name given to a disease, he would have also pointed out the *graduation* in the value of its symptoms. But this is not seen in Hahnemann's works, though Dr. Hering (c. v. p. 25) speaks of different grades and of a relative value. On the contrary, by stating *all* the symptoms elicited by his experiments without any graduation, and by his aversion to the names of diseases, he palpably distrusts the worth of *characteristic* symptoms, and only adopts them, as he adopts and rejects every thing, when it suits his convenience. Thus, if any one says, "This drug must only be given to a person of such or such peculiar form, with certain definite features, with a little wart on the right cheek shaped so and so, and a small pimple on the left one, coloured so and so, etc. etc. *just like* the image I have given you, in order to ascertain *all exactly;* you are earnestly forbidden to account for *the least* deficiency of the quoted symptoms by reasoning; and unless you find *all* things *exactly* as I have stated, you cannot administer this drug, without the greatest probability that you will injure, perhaps kill the patient;" these being exactly the directions of Hahnemann and Dr. Hering, according to the quotation mentioned above: we ask, can the conscientious homæopathist, to whom this task is confided, allow any deduction to be made of forty, sixty, or, as Hahnemann says, even of upwards of ninety-six per cent. from the drug-symptoms of his drug-sickness catechism; can he administer the drug with any prospect of cure, when called to a patient, whose disease does not exactly resemble the image; nay! who might perhaps present one or two only of upwards of 1400 drug symptoms?—By such a reduction of characteristics in natural history, there would be no difference between a flea and an elephant.

In overlooking in Hahnemann the great nonsense, which, as we have seen, his interpretation of similia similibus curantur involves, it is at least evident that he substitutes for the old axiom "cessante causa cessfat etiam effectus," its reverse, "cessante effectu cessat etiam causa." This great nonsensical ὕστερον πρότερον of the human intellect and of all experience, has put him in the dilemma, either

to insist upon the indispensability of his symptomatology, and of all the minutiæ connected with it, without admitting the least deduction; or to decide merely by his authority that the fundamental maxim of his doctrine, proclaimed by him as the law of nature, admits of exceptions, although every rational person must admit that it is thus totally subverted. As long as he did not deviate from his repeated assertions, that the minutest symptom of the drug-sickness materially belongs to the true image of the disease, as well as the minutest lineament belongs to a true portrait, or as the definite situation of the many pieces of coloured glass exactly belong to a definite figure in the kaleidoscope, he was, at least, consistent; but when he admits that some and even many symptoms may be missing, without material injury to the safest treatment, or still more, as we shall see soon, that all chronic diseases, amounting in his catalogue to upwards of 400, depend *only on one latent* and therefore *imperceptible*, or rather on no symptom; then we must declare that he himself has evidently destroyed the greatest support of his whole doctrine, even in the eyes of his most devoted adherents, provided they are impartial and reasonable.

By adverting, however, to the quotations above cited from the Concise View, we see that its author still follows with consistency the original maxim of his master, as he appears unwilling to admit of any deduction. But then we cannot comprehend how he can even partially fulfill the following promises, given in the common unworthy language of his fellowship on page 25. "The "most acute and dangerous diseases, as inflammation of the lungs, "pleurisy, inflammation of the brain and liver and of the ear, apo- "plexy and convulsions, most of the diseases of children, and "even the most malignant forms of typhus are the easiest of all in "the choice of a remedy." Let us leave unnoticed the substance of these rhodomontades, worthy only of a man of that class in which the author has ranged himself, by the whole tenor of his Concise View; let us for the present suppress that just indignation which every man of sound morals and feelings will share with us, when he sees proclaimed by a well educated professional man, the promises, that *most* of the *diseases of children*, and even the *most malignant* forms of typhus are *the easiest of all* in the choice of a *remedy*, and of course also to cure; brags more characteristic than any homœopathic symptom of times long past, when the oddly-

dressed doctor proclaimed from his stage in market-places, to the gazing public, how wonderfully he can cure all diseases! Can any one imagine, that a human being could, under all circumstances, comply with the mentioned requisites of a correct homœopathic diagnosis without divination?

How few individuals possess a perfect knowledge of themselves and of their own mental and moral dispositions?—a knowledge so rare, that the inscription on the Appollonian temple at Delphi, "γνωθι σεαυτον," "know thyself," struck the mind of one of the wisest Greeks, and is still considered, by all philosophers, as the highest attribute of human wisdom. How few patients can express their feelings, and minutely relate the numerous symptoms occurring during an attack of a severe disease? Is it not ridiculous to expect, for instance, from a senseless *apoplectic*, or from one affected by *malignant typhus fever*, generally attended with violent delirium, *only one* of the multitude of reports alluded to above as indispensable for selecting a proper drug? How very few, if any, of the fair sex would condescend to open the remotest recesses of their thoughts and feelings, and to permit the young priest of Æsculapius to institute a minute examination, for ascertaining whether a small wart, or something like it, be located on the shoulder or elsewhere!

We have already stated, that the large stock of words and expressions in one of the richest languages upon earth, the German, proved insufficient for Hahnemann properly to render the terms of his symptomatology. The numerous and frequently barbarous expressions of all shades of feelings, never heard of before, make it difficult for a well-educated German, even if he be minutely acquainted with the different provincialisms of his native country, to understand all the singular terms and expressions of Hahnemann's symptomatology, many of which are newly created by him: and unless he, as well as his patient, attentively study them for a long time, it must be almost impossible for a German homœopathist to practise with the requisite exactness, even in his native country.

In order to give here a single specimen of "the accuracy hitherto unknown," and the "minutiæ and niceties unheard of before," we shall quote only the following different expressions of pain, which Hahnemann states must be distinguished minutely,

and which are indispensable for a correct diagnosis.—See Organon, § 90. and Kopp. l. c. p. 22.—

"Einfach (simple), stumpf (obtuse), pressend (pressing), drueckend (compressing), spannend (bending), klemmend (jamming), kneipend (pinching), shneidend (cutting), stechend (stinging), ziehend (drawing), reissend (tearing), zuckend (shrugging), strœmend (streaming), wuehlend (crawling), drehend (turning), bohrend (boring), windend (twisting), nagend (gnawing), fressend (eating), dehnend (extending), kratzend (scratching), pochend (knocking): to which we might add some equally important, as zitternd (quivering), brennend (burning), feilend (filing), kitzlend (tickling), etc. Each of these 26 expressions having a meaning of its own, and Hahnemann requiring also the compound ones, we have the following number of expressions for pain, if we add only the combinations by 2 and 3:—

Simple expressions	- - -	26
Combinations of two	- - -	325
——————— three	- - -	2,600
Different expressions	- Total	2,951

As in the same manner all other feelings and complaints of the patient are minutely to be ascertained, written down, and compared with the image in the large gallery of all the drug-sickness-symptoms, by a faithful homœopathist, it is easy to comprehend "that the advantage of short visits, and quickly writing a recipe, "cannot be reconciled with homœopathia." (See Concise View, p. 25).—It would be best for the doctor to board with his patient for a few weeks until his minute inquiries are concluded.

What language less rich than the German could render all the expressions in Hahnemann's works intelligible! it must have been very troublesome, even for an able translator of his Organon only, to translate them into French, Italian, English, or any other language; and more so with many vulgar terms, contained in all his works: inconveniences which will make them unfit for an *exact* translation, and partially unintelligible to foreigners, without a voluminous glossary. No foreign patient could therefore make himself well understood by his German homœopathist, without a previous tiresome study of such a glossary; and scarcely will a foreign homœopathist ever become so minutely acquainted with

the homœopathic terminology, as is necessary to be exactly understood by his patients, who must not only be free from nervous debility, from any disease of his head, chest, etc. but must possess strong respiratory organs, very stout nerves, considerable talkativeness, and above all, a large allopathic dose of angelic patience, fully to satisfy the minute cross-examinations of a faithful homœopathist.—It must indeed be very curious to witness the cross-examinations of a native of "the sanguinary Gold Coast," or of "Egypt, the land of monsters," by such a wonderful sprig of the arbor vitæ flourishing at Coethen, who, without being well acquainted with the language, customs, etc. of that country, has carried there "the new art of healing!"

The numerous and indispensable exigencies for a homœopathic diagnosis and infallible cure, appear to us not less curious, in respect to the *particular ease*, promised by the discreet and worthy Dr. Hering, for the cure of the *most acute and dangerous* diseases of children. How is it possible to dispense, in these cases, at once with *almost all* symptoms, and be nevertheless so confident of the *right* diagnosis and *safe cure* of the *most dangerous* acute diseases? In these cases there must be, for the homœopathist, something present, not to be met with in adults; some of the many miracles of homœopathia, secretly revealed by Hahnemann only to some of his beloved and more initiated disciples, by which a new-born baby can tell all the minutiæ of its feelings, dreams, etc. and all that happened during its embryo-life.—Probably we shall occasionally hear something highly interesting about some developed virtues, — about "domestic felicity," promoted already at this period of human life by homœopathists; and about many other objects which have hitherto remained concealed from all stupid allopathists and naturalists. This hope will not seem extravagant and ridiculous to any one who reads, in Hahnemann's work on Chron. Dis. (vol. i. p. 173) among many other very amusing narratives, quoted by the "old philosopher," in corroboration of his "great truth," that "a *new-born* baby, only a *few days old*, will "constantly *rub and scratch* the place where his hereditary itch "is located."

Indeed! we, and certainly many of our respected colleagues in all quarters of the globe, would "again become students," (C. V. p. 16) to learn from these high-gifted men, how they can dis-

pense with so many symptoms for the easy cure of most dangerous acute diseases of deaf and dumb persons; and if "upon the *full-*
"*ness* and *accuracy* with which the symptoms are noted, *the entire*
"management of the cure rests;" to hear by what miracle this poor class is likewise exempt from the *minute* description of all their thoughts and feelings so imperatively required from all other patients? Are all their diseases to be considered forthwith as latent itch, or are they, when sick, to be left without the never-failing homœopathic aid, and exposed to be murdered by allopathists?—Though now the unfortunate lunatics might be rescued from their "leaden fetters, the bitterest human misery" by the "great truth," it is however highly important to know also how they can enjoy the blessings of homœopathia, as they are either unable minutely to report their feelings, or cannot do this satisfactorily to their benevolent homœopathic doctor?

In observing a regular course, we should now treat of Hahnemann's third and last maxim. As, however, his treatise on chronic diseases is more connected with the second than with the third maxim, we prefer to dwell here awhile upon this very intellectual gem of the great genius.—We cannot do better than to commence with the emphatic expression made by Dr. Hering upon the same work on p. 18 of his Concise View. There he says, "while thus "with blessings on its wings, the great discovery reached to every "quarter of the earth, the master was silent, and his disciples ima-"gined that he now reposed upon his laurels. But the old philo-"sopher did not rest, and while his hair was growing gray on his "head, enriched with science, enriched with experience, his mind "still retained its youthful vigour, and he boldly penetrated still "deeper into the mysteries of nature. When an old man, at the "age of 73, he suddenly surprised his astonished admirers with a "new and great work, which far transcended all preceding disco-"veries, and more then redoubled the power of the homœopathic "physician," etc.—How true the expression in Solomon's Book of Wisdom, ch. iv. v. 9.—"But wisdom is the gray hair unto men, "and an unspotted life is old age."

Hahnemann's preface to this work begins with the following words, characteristic of his *pneumatic* laurels and of his youthful vigour. "If I were ignorant of the object of my existence on this "earth—to improve myself and to ameliorate the condition of all

"around me, to the best of my exertions, I should consider myself "very imprudent in publishing, before my death, an art which is "peculiar to myself, and which, if concealed, might continue to be "extremely profitable to me."

One would think, that if any thing could bring homœopathists to reason, nothing could have been better adapted than this "great "work, which really far transcended all preceding discoveries"—in hair-brained nonsense; and it will serve as a new proof that those who once believe implicitly, can hardly ever be rescued from their credulity and superstition. Indeed, yet in itself it is difficult to conceive how "the power of the homœopathic physician," which has been already before always and absolutely curing with the greatest safety and quickness, and which never committed any error, could become by this great work "more than redoubled" unless they can now raise from the dead patients killed by allopathists? Every impartial reader, however, who has noticed Hahnemann's earlier productions, must have been astonished, that after all the whimsical suggestions which he has stated in his Organon and in his Materia Medica, so many could remain which he published in 1828, in this voluminous work; as he himself states, "after a "painful labour of twelve years;"—a space of time, worthy of such a monstrosity, which presents but few or rather no traces of human understanding. Indeed, no science whatever, not even medicine, so exuberantly rich in the most whimsical and absurd suggestions, can present a work, so crowded from beginning to end, with such absurdities.

The probable cause why Hahnemann has undertaken this "gigantic work," we believe to be, that he was aware of the stumbling block, which he himself has laid in the way of his second homœopathic maxim, similia similibus curantur, by its minute dependance on so many symptoms, and that he could only remove this great obstacle, which in most cases would nullify the practical application of his doctrine, in revoking his former rigorous exigencies by a new dictatorial decree, which admits not only a very large deduction of symptoms, but which directly teaches, that in most diseases homœpathia can dispense with them *entirely*. Hahnemann, after his Organon was published, must have seen more clearly the insurmountable difficulties of his doctrine, if the minute distinction of symptoms in the much larger number of chronic complaints, should be regarded as indispensable as it was in

acute diseases. It must have appeared to him impossible, and a task far exceeding one man's life, to ascertain with the least shadow of credibility what drug, among the immense number of which he had tried only about sixty, would produce, if administered to healthy persons, a disease not depending upon exalted feelings, imagination, implicit belief or premeditated deception, but upon *real* changes obvious to the senses of every observer. He would also hardly have found any of his disciples, however otherwise willing to satisfy the whims of their master from implicit faith, credulity, or respect for his "extraordinary talents," who would have quietly condescended to be the subject of experiments, intended for ascertaining, which one of the simple drugs might produce consumption, apoplexy, hernia inguinalis, carcinoma, or any other of those diseases, which have been generally considered as dangerous and fatal, for centuries not yet enlightened by homœopathia. It was an easy task for a devoted disciple or an infatuated adept to state, after taking the decillionth part of a grain of the extract of Henbane, (see Materia Medica, Vol. IV.) I feel giddy, a headache, stiffness in my neck, shaking, tickling and humming in my ears; I feel jealous, inclined to injure others and to kill myself, &c.; or he might even have appeared to stagger, to tremble when walking, to convulse his eyes and his limbs a little, &c. The patient may also have exultingly praised the delivery from all his propensities, pains, &c.

"Tantum cura potest et ars doloris,
"Desit fingere Cælius Podagram."—*Martial.*

All these may be the natural effects of an exalted imagination, of courtesy towards an inquisitive man, who evidently wishes to hear such extraordinary reports, or be a consequence of such experiments as we have tried to explain. But the author of homœopathia, if he has ever been so foolish as to believe that all chronic diseases could be produced in healthy persons by drugs, could not expect his most obliging disciple to come forth in the vigour of health, and to present, after a few experiments with the virtue developed from a decillionth part of a grain of common table salt, charcoal, &c., or by an artificial infection with itch, all the symptoms of a pulmonary consumption, of a bad carcinoma, of an inguinal rupture, of a nasty disfiguring itch, &c., or even to commit murder, suicide, &c.; all of which are the symptoms of upwards of 400 chronic diseases, and all of which arise simply from itch-sickness, as is to

be seen in Samuel Hahnemann's work on Chronic Diseases, Vol. I., from page 93 to 136. Should such experiments even partially succeed in producing one of the many horrible diseases, but afterwards fail in not reestablishing the former healthy state, Hahnemann not only ran the risk of putting at once his doctrine and reputation at stake, but had also to fear the laws of the country, which willingly permitted him to continue his fanciful doctrine and his negatively innocent practice, but which would have inflicted upon him an allopathic dose of the punishment, prescribed by law for all experiments by which human health and life are injured. These difficulties must have increased when he considered the multifarious species and varieties of many chronic diseases, already minutely distinguished from each other, especially by the great progress and discoveries of pathological anatomy; had he treated of these diseases singly, he might possibly have coincided in some topics with those whom he stigmatized as idiots and murderers.

Hahnemann for these reasons was forced to dispose *by wholesale* of all the chronic diseases, physical as well as mental, and to *abandon* for them his fundamental maxim, similia similibus curantur, substituting for it a new theory, which he emphatically calls "the great truth." The substance of this is, that *itch* is the *only cause* of seven-eighths of *all chronic diseases*, leaving only one-eighth for syphilis and for a disease termed by him sykosis or wart-sickness, the former however having the larger share.*

Hahnemann being also aware that, in most cases, it would be impossible to trace, even distantly, the origin of a chronic disease to an infection by itch, advises his followers, in many parts of his work on chronic diseases, and also in the last edition of his Organon, nevertheless always confidently to suppose in such cases the existence of a *latent* itch, namely, of such a one which is *imperceptible by any of our senses*, and which of course *presents no symptom at all.* This is stated by the *same* man, who, a few pages before, in the *same* work, applies the term "murderers" to

* Ignorant homœopathists consider *sykosis* likewise as one of the great discoveries made by Hahnemann, though it was known under the same term to Galen and other older Greek authors, according to Celsus, who, in his work de Medicina, l. vi. cap. 3, explicitly says, "est enim ulcus quod, a *fici* similitudine σύκωσις a Græcis nominatur, quia caro in eo excrescit." It is pardonable to this old author, that he considered it as a specific disease and as independent of syphilis, which of course was unknown to him; although sykosis may sometimes depend on other dyscrasiæ, especially on the tubercular; it frequently exists merely as a slight local affection, like other parasitical productions of an increased or changed local vegetative process, without any constitutional cause, or any influence upon health.

all his professional predecessors and contemporaries, who are so crazy as to say, " remove the cause of the disease if you intend ra- " dically to remove its effects, or the disease itself;" this was done by the *same* man who says in the *same* work, (Organon, p. 15), when speaking of the different specific morbid matters adopted by the old schools, as the scrophulous,-herpetic,-gout-matter, &c.: " Who, of all the nosologists, has ever seen with his corporeal " eyes such a morbid matter, of which he can speak with so great " a confidence as to prescribe a medical treatment for it?" this was done by the *same* man, who still makes it a sacred duty for his disciples and followers exactly to observe his advice, expressed in his " Reine Arzney mittellehre" or " Materia Medica," second edit. 1825, Vol. III. on page 6, in the following manner: " Take " one case after another, put down all its discoverable symptoms, " according to the direction of the Organon, with such minute- " ness, that the founder of homœopathia himself could not object " in the least to its perfect exactitude; in every individual case " apply the proper homœopathic medicine, pure and unmixed, " in as small a dose as the doctrine prescribes, but *have also all* " *other remedial influences removed from the patient*, as is ex- " pressly required; and if this mode will not cure the disease " easily, quickly, and durably, then blame this doctrine; I repeat, " then expose to public contempt this doctrine, which so seriously " threatens to destroy the old darkness, by placing before the " public, legally confirmed, the particulars of a cure, *attempted* " *strictly in compliance with the homœopathic doctrine.*"

Hahnemann seems so enraptured with his itch, that since he published his " great truth," he thinks it not worth while to speak much about the two other chronic diseases, syphilis and sykosis; and even in § 168 of his Organon, (4th edit.) he appears to have again abandoned the newly adopted copartnership of sykosis; nay! it would not be very difficult to prove, from some other passages in his work, that he is disposed to regard all acute diseases as likewise arising simply from itch, and that he considers, therefore, the latter as the innate physical sin of the human race, existing from Adam down to the present age; so that the terms disease and itch are almost considered by him as synonymous.

The adoption of the itch as the cause of many diseases, is a very antiquated opinion, though it has never been carried so far as it is now by Hahnemann. This has probably induced Hahne-

mann to give to the general infection by itch the preference over any other similar cause of which he was in need.

We may well imagine that a voluminous work, containing the results of new experiments in natural philosophy, chemistry, or in any other branch of natural history, might many years be withheld before its author, anxious to corroborate the validity of his discovery, resolves to publish his researches. But Hahnemann's painful labour during twelve years, as stated by himself, can only be explained by his consulting ancient authors, in order to find what general cause of all chronic diseases has been preeminently adopted by medical authors. In this way he has found that *scabies suppressa* was the cause chiefly mentioned among all the presumed material causes of many, and particularly of chronic diseases.—That he has only secretly brooded over this great truth, without instituting experiments, becomes more evident by the statement of Dr. Hering, that "he was silent," and that his "disciples imagined "that he now reposed upon his laurels." He could not have instituted all these experiments secretly on himself, nor does he mention that he did so. He must therefore, besides the literary investigations mentioned, have perhaps collected only some single experiments with drugs on healthy persons, for which he could not find a proper place in his homœopathic doctrine; and by all means this statement, made by himself and his disciples, proves likewise clearly, that he indulged here again in his old propensity to secrecy, otherwise we should think that he would have been anxious to communicate the "great truth" as soon as possible, at least to some of his disciples, and to see it confirmed also by their practice.

The opinion of infection by itch, as the principal cause of most chronic diseases, was very popular during many ages down to the last century, especially in Germany. In cities like Fuerth, in Bavaria, where we passed our youth, itch being endemic, or having been so at least for many years before we left it, it is not strange that such an opinion was very common, not only among professional men, but also among the public, as we observed in the practice of our deceased father, who was one of the most distinguished physicians in that place.*

* Among those modern authors who believe itch to be the cause of many diseases, may be named also Professor Autenrieth of the University of Tuebingen, as he sug-

Many of these apprehensions were correct, since numerous chronic and acute diseases originated in itch; though not in this disease itself, so much as in the obnoxious prejudices which formerly attended its long-protracted treatment. Hahnemann asserts a

gested in a treatise, "de morbis e scabie oriundis, magistratuum attentione non "indignis, Tubingæ, 1807," of which Hahnemann could not have been ignorant, though to our knowledge he has not been just enough to give him credit for it. This is also the case, we believe, with his maxim, similia similibus curantur, to which not only Haller but also Professor Blumenbach at Gœttingen has alluded long before Hahnemann. This great naturalist, as we slightly remember, has in one of his first works (Introductio in historiam medicinæ literariam) about fifty years ago, very distinctly alluded to this maxim, and much more so than the celebrated Albertus Haller did, though as may be expected from this distinguished professor, likewise in the sense of the expression we suggested above.—It appears also a little strange that Hahnemann, who by his suggestion of the cause of Asiatic Cholera seems to be so remarkably fond of insects, did not notice Lancisi's theory, which has been adopted by many distinguished naturalists, and even by Linné and Morgagni, viz. that the itch depends always upon a peculiar insect, Acarus or Cheyletus scabiei, frequently portrayed, as for instance in the treatise of Wichmann, "on the itch." (Ætiologie der Krætze.) This would have rendered the excessive propagation of itch more explicable, and the "great truth" at all events *more lively*. He would not have sacrificed any originality by adopting the Acarus scabiei, as he has already secured his place in the history of medicine. His opinion that Cholera is caused by small insects is likewise not original, and he must have known that dysentery, so similar to Asiatic Cholera, was long before his time ascribed to insects by Friedr. Hoffmann, Linné, Latreille, and others. His originality consists in the following; he has written different treatises about Asiatic Cholera without *ever having seen one* patient suffering by Asiatic Cholera; he has prophesied that *no* patient will die after his camphor-treatment, though *not one* was manifestly saved by it; and that according to him, also another great remedy for this scourge, oleum cajeputæ, (which proved not less ineffectual than camphor, and in a few cases was useful only like any other essential oil,) must *always contain copper*; this is likewise *false*, since the most exact chemical analyses are unable to detect it. Were he less ignorant of the elements of the "overrefined" chemistry, he would not have resorted to this false opinion of copper, but would have made use of the beneficial effect of oil of cajeput as a particular argument in favor of his opinion, so emphatically expressed about the camphor treatment, since this essential oil, like most others, much resembles camphor, and contains a considerable quantity of it. But according to his usual mode of reasoning, concluding from the similarity between the green colour of some solutions of copper and of the same in the oil of cajeput, he determined that henceforth copper must be the homœopathic poison or allopathic remedy for his animalcula cholerica, which neither he nor any mortal being has ever seen, which he never subjected to his experiments similar to those on healthy persons, and which therefore, of course, he could not know how to make drug-sick or to kill. The uselessness of copper in Asiatic Cholera, in spite of all the medical *bulls*, prophecies and commands which emanated from the high pontifical see at Cœthen, against these barbarous eastern intruders, may however not be the fault of the great philosopher, since these little infusoria appear to possess rather a tough constitution, and not to be affected by itch; they seem at least as insensible to the virtues developed by homœopathists as they are to a severe Russian winter, to a scorching West Indian summer, and to all the tremendous remedies of the medical profession; this free country however excepted, where these cruel little autocrats appear to have found their conquerors. An American homœopathist has already published that he has cured *all* his cholera patients by Hahnemann's camphor-treatment, though as we have seen above, his homœopathic brethren in Europe were not so happy. Another who left a populous city and his patients at the approach of the cholera in 1832, told us that after safely returning late in September, he cured more than 600 patients, although it is notorious, that not one physician of the same city, who attended the largest hospital during the whole epidemic saw in all six hundred patients; it is also known that the epidemic abated suddenly, and that towards the end of September only a few sporadic cases of it existed.—So much for the *veracious* statements of some homœopathists!

gross falsehood, in saying that the bad consequences of itch principally arose from considering it as not constitutional, and from treating it with external remedies only. The contrary is the case, for until the last thirty years, the profession has erroneously considered itch and similar chronic exanthematic diseases as always merely constitutional, and has believed a long treatment by internal antidyscrasic remedies alone as useful; it really became constitutional by disturbances of the reproductive system thus artificially produced, and when at last external remedies were resorted to, many of which were injurious to health, the worst consequences arose therefrom, which in our times are never to be feared from a judicious local treatment.

Hahnemann, regardless of the great difference between miasma and contagion,* and comprising both under the former term, considers the itch-miasma as the most infectious of all diseases.—Tracing, by a shining display of Hebrew, Greek, &c., its origin back even to the records of sacred history, he leaves others to conjecture how this scourge, by which the human race has been inflicted with so many, so multifarious and so dangerous diseases, first commenced many thousand years ago, (see Chr. Dis., Vol. I. page 15 and 199.)

This doctrine of Samuel Hahnemann, if properly acknowledged, cannot fail to cause an immense revolution in all the diversified relations of human life. We are justified in anticipating this, when we observe that Hahnemann ascribes not only all physical chronic diseases, but also all morbid alienations of the human mind solely to itch, (see Chr. Dis., Vol. I., from page 28 to page 134.) This will be more clearly understood if we merely refer to the latter, and consider that most, if not all mental diseases origi-

* Hahnemann nullifying, whenever it suits him, all facts ascertained by repeated observations of distinguished naturalists and almost all medical practitioners, says on Vol. II. pages 6 and 7, of his Materia Medica, "No man can be infected by the virus "secreted from his own syphilitic ulcer or gonorrhœa, any more than a viper can kill "or only hurt itself by its own poison in a dangerous manner." He is therefore ignorant or wilfully denies that the eyes of persons, infected by their own gonorrhoic virus, were in thousands of instances severely attacked by the most dangerous, and frequently incurable and destructive ophthalmia, and also that, as has been repeatedly observed by naturalists, the scorpion and the rattle-snake if enraged, without being capable of hurting their aggressor, kill themselves by their own sting or bite.—We call the attention of the reader to this single instance of the many in the homœopathic doctrine, which strikingly prove the immense and irreparable injury which must arise from an implicit belief in the ravings of its author; since every well educated physician should know, that eyes inflamed by the gonorrhoic vicus will to all probability be forever lost within less than twenty-four hours, if proper aid is not immediately administered.

nate in passion, and that the higher degrees of all passions are justly regarded by the philosophers of all ages as particular kinds of madness. If therefore all the different kinds and varieties of the latter solely depend upon itch, according to the "great truth" discovered by Hahnemann, it follows, a fortiori, that henceforth, none of the passions in men, the most noble as well as the most depraved, can originate from any thing else than from itch.

Ardent love, or

"———sacred fire that burn'st mightily
"In living breast ykindled first above,"

being only a symptom of *latent* itch, the individual affected by it without having his love returned, must henceforth submit to a homœopathic antipsoric treatment. The itchy pair, prevented from a more pleasant radical cure by their obstinate parents, will now undoubtedly be radically cured by antipsorics, in a manner fully satisfactory also to their too scrupulous parents, who otherwise would have perhaps repented, when too late, of their harsh behaviour, not remembering those joyful times when they also were affected in a similar manner by the itch.

The husband, who before the great truth was revealed to the world, was made unhappy by the jealousy of his "green-eyed" wife, will no longer deplore his disastrous fate; since the homœopathists can now cure by their developed virtues the true cause of this odious passion, the itch, and thus tie again the nuptial knots loosened by jealousy, with the rosy garlands of renewed confidence and constant love.

The gloomy verses of the great moralising poet, Young.

"O Britain, infamous for suicide,
"An island in thy manners! far disjoined
"From the whole world of rationals besides,
"In ambient waves plunge thy polluted head,
"Wash the dire stain, nor shock the continent."—

will be expunged, as soon as these high-minded islanders accept "a treasure like this new art;" since latent itch is the only cause of suicide. (See Chr. Dis. Vol. I. p. 135.) But we would advise them not "to plunge in ambient waves," nor to "wash the dire "stain," but to use antipsorics, because, according to Hahnemann, the latent itch becomes severer and rebellious by all external remedies, and of course therefore also by washing.

The decillionth developed virtue of table-salt, charcoal or a si-

milar antipsoric will disarm and transmute into the most amiable philanthropist,

> " The secret enemy, whose sleepless eye
> " Stands sentinel—accuser—judge—and spy,
> " The foe—the fool—the jealous—and the vain,
> " The envious who but breathe in other's pain."—*Byron.*

All the deformities of children before birth, and their different anomalous positions, arise only from itch, (see l. c. p. 233), and the accoucheurs will no longer be obliged to trouble the suffering women and themselves with the forceps and other instruments hitherto recommended by the stupid and murderous allopathists. Should they meet with cases of difficult labor, they may rather apply a virtue developed from an antipsoric, and call again in some days or weeks, in order to observe its " after-operation," and to ascertain if the delivery has become easy or requires another antipsoric virtue for some weeks or months longer, until at last the " salutary after-operation" of the homœopathic dose has fulfilled the parental hopes and joys.

Inguinal ruptures will henceforth happen very seldom, if proper care is taken to prevent them by antipsorics, since, (loc. cit. p. 108), we are taught that, a few cases of sudden violence excepted, the itch is always their principal and only cause.—As all the great geniuses are not always disposed minutely to express their meaning, but speak often aphoristically, so also our Samuel in regard to this topic; he leaves all mankind in darkness why hernia *inguinalis* only will be certainly prevented and cured without trusses and other remedies by an antipsoric treatment, and why not likewise hernia cruralis, umbilicalis and all similar ruptures? We remain also ignorant whether the antipsoric will cure *all kinds* of bubonovele, enterocele, epiplocele, entero-epiplocele, &c., or *only one* kind.

The criminal laws will undergo, by our great reformer, much greater changes than ever, not excepting even those made by Charles V., in his penal code; and then every rogue will be cunning enough to apologize, and justly claim indulgence for his offence, by a " small wart or pimple," located somewhere; perhaps, also, the crime committed will clearly prove, that he is far beyond all moral responsibility from his moral incapacity to resist the bad influence of the latent itch, located in his heart, his hands, or somewhere else, and he will palpably show that he deserves,

therefore, to be subjected to a regular homœopathic antipsoric treatment, rather than to be punished with solitary confinement or perhaps even death.

Hahnemann, at any rate, advocates the abolishment of punishment by death, and renders it very expedient to subject, in future, all the inmates of state prisons, if the people should not soon dispense with such cruel allopathic institutions, to an antipsoric treatment, in large itch-hospitals.

All mankind will be greatly benefitted by Hahnemann's great truth, as it will not merely prevent the self-destruction of the human race by itch, which, being the only cause of all mental maladies, as murder, suicide, &c., might easily affect people epidemically, and lead them to kill one another, or to commit suicide *en masse*, but will also deliver mankind from almost the only infectious cause of all chronic diseases. War, the destroyer of human life, will cease to exist, since it unquestionably arises from many heinous passions, and, of course, therefore, from itch; and consequently the great problem of all philanthropists and philosophers, in regard to *eternal peace*, will be solved by Hahnemann's great discovery; perhaps by the virtue developed from *one* grain of table-salt.

The reader can easily picture for himself the great changes in all trades, and in all other occupations of human society, after this immense discovery, shall be justly appreciated by every one. Poor allopathic physicians, apothecaries, wholesale druggists, and undertakers, are the only sufferers severely visited, and should hasten to turn their attention to some other profitable business, which might indemnify them for the great injury inflicted on them by this immense progress of the human intellect, as proclaimed by "one of the greatest benefactors of mankind"—Samuel Hahnemann.*

* It is indeed astonishing that the great philologists, with all their endeavours to prove that every language is based upon the philosophical conceptions of its nation, and is especially expressive in its idioms, sentences, proverbs, &c., did not discover before Hahnemann the intimate connexion of itch and moral faults, because the few languages which we are able to consult, in regard to this topic, signify this connexion very distinctly; the Greek χνιζω and καταχνιζω signifies *itch*, also *to make*, or *to be angry*, to make *jealous*, χνιζεσθαι τινος, to be *inflamed by love*, &c.; The Latin *scabies*, is a word very expressive for propensities and *passion*, of some of which Hahnemann has constantly felt the irresistible impulse (concupiscentia.) In this manner Horace says, Ep. I. 12, 14, to his friend.

"Cum tu inter scabiem tantam et contagia lucri
"Nil parvum sapias et adhuc sublima cures!"

In a similar manner, Lucilius ap. Non. 2. n. 701, says:

"Corruptus scabie et porrigine plenus."

Before we leave this topic to discuss the third and last maxim of homœopathia, we think it advisable to quote some of Hahnemann's remarkable explanations of his itch-doctrine, though, to show his sentiments, judgment, and style, we have already extracted the first sentence of the preface to his treatise on chronic diseases. We omit, purposely, any comment upon the mean and disgraceful sentiments and feelings, the total disregard of any thing like consistency, and the vulgar style contained in the following few quotations, selected from the many with which this work of Hahnemann likewise abounds, leaving their examination to the impartial judgment of the critic.

"Nos hac a scabie tenemus ungues."—*Martial.*

To prove more minutely the correctness of his itch-doctrine, Hahnemann says, in Vol I. p. p. 89, 90 and 91, of this large work, mentioned:—"But again, if a favorable situation should arrest "the progress of the disease, after it had broken out, real health "cannot be reestablished by any method hitherto known, and the "common allopathic treatment with active and improper drugs, "baths, mercury, prussic acid, starvation, and other fashionable "remedies, only accelerates approaching death, the termination of "all sufferings incurable by physicians. Thus a merchant, strong "and apparently healthy, some symptoms of latent itch excepted, "which are perceptible only to a judge, will, by several unfortunate "business transactions, be gradually reduced in his wealth, until

and Cicero, Leg. I. 17, "quia hac scabie carent." The verb *prurire* signifies to *itch*, and also to *deserve punishment* for some wrong or offence committed; for instance, "num malae an dentes tibi pruriunt." See Plauti Poenolus V. 5. 36. In the English the substantive *itch*, and the verb *to itch*, correspond together in regard to the propensity of doing *some wrong*; thus in Shaksp. Wives of Windsor "If I see a sword "out, my fingers *itch* to make one," or my fingers *itch* to be at him, which signifies at all events, *some wrong* intended; the French expression, "la peau, le dos lui *demange*," means, he deserves punishment; the same is the meaning with the Italian "*pizzicare, aver prurito*, mi pizzicano le mani, e tile reni," and with the German, "der "Buckel juckt ihn; die Haende oder finger jucken ihn," &c.; the same, as one feels an irresistible propensity to steal, &c. The word "*shabby*," *schaebig*, common to the English and German languages, signifies *itchy*, and likewise the most contemptible propensity, "*avaricious*." What can confirm the correctness of the "great truth," more than to find in the languages of the most civilized nations such synonymous expressions, which they were artlessly, and almost inconsciously forced to adopt, on account of the similiarity of two things!—Is Dr. Hering not fully in the right when he says on page 18 of his C. V. that this "new and great work far transcended all preceding "discoveries, and more than redoubled the power of the homœopathic physician?" If we ever have repented of not possessing greater philological acquirements, it is at this moment, in order to do justice to the great genius, by better and similar quotations from other languages. Hahnemann must have been unconscious of these important arguments for his great truth, otherwise he would have mentioned them in his works. May he graciously accept this, our small offering, by which he, as a more accomplished scholar, will be led still more to improve his elevated idea—of the itch.

" he is almost bankrupt, and at the same time he will be affected " with different illnesses, and be eventually attacked by a serious " disease. But the death of a rich relative, or the gain of a high " prize in the lottery, abundantly restores his losses; he becomes " a wealthy man, and nevertheless his disease continues every year, " in spite of all medical prescriptions and of all his visits to the " most famous mineral springs.

" Since the cause must always be proportionate and equal to its " effects, the reason to its consequences, as is ever the case in na- " ture, no body can understand, why, in this case, after the re- " moval of the external attacks upon the health of the person, the " following evils should not only continue, but grow also worse " from year to year, unless there existed another and a higher " cause—acting in such a manner, that these loathsome events, " both having disappeared and being therefore unable to consti- " tute a cause sufficient for the following chronic disease, can only " be considered as the occasional cause for the developement of a " more important hostile power, which had already existed before " internally, but in a slumbering state."

In further corroboration of his acute and deep logical conclusions, he continues on the same pages :—" A modest girl, believed to be " perfectly healthy, symptoms of internal itch excepted, is forced " into a marriage, which makes her soul unhappy; her bodily " health begins to decay, without any signs of syphilitic infection. " Her calamitous complaints can be ameliorated by no medicine, " and they assume a still more serious character. In the midst " of this state, after a year of suffering, the cause of her misfor- " tunes, the husband, detested by her, suddenly dies, and she re- " vives, convinced that she is now relieved from the very cause of " all her mental and physical sufferings, and entertains the hope " of a speedy recovery; all her friends share her anticipations, as " the cause which has excited her disease lays now in the grave. " She indeed improves rapidly; but, contrary to all expectations, " she remains sickly, the strength of her youth notwithstanding; " her sufferings cease but rarely, and are renewed from time to " time, without any apparent cause, and seem even to become " more severe every year, (during the inclement season)," &c. Hahnemann repeats again more distinctly :—" Indeed if these un- " happy events had been the causes, the efficient causes of the " symptoms of the disease, would it not follow, that their effect,

" the disease, should have also ceased entirely after the causes was
" removed? But the complaints do not cease, they are renewed,
" and even increased and it becomes manifest, that these unhappy
" events could not have been a sufficient cause for the complaints
" now existing; it is obvious that they have served only as an
" impulse to the developement of a sickness, which hitherto has
" slumbered within the body. The diagnosis of this old and fre-
" quently internal enemy, and the knowledge how to defeat it,
" render it evident, that generally an internal itch (psora) has
" caused all these sufferings, which cannot be appeased, even by
" the power of the strongest constitution, but can be overcome only
" by the healing art."

So much for Dr. Hering's and his brother homœopathists' "old " philosopher enriched with experience," and the "treasury of new " observations and experience scarcely to be overlooked," (see page 18 of the Concise View.)

Those who are able and willing to read in the original, the reasons for "the great truth" in extenso, will find no page of the four big volumes to contain any more sense than our quotations, which we have selected only as the easiest to translate; they generally display nonsense not less disgraceful.

We now come to the third and last maxim of homœopathia, which says, that by certain mechanical processes from all natural substances, and especially from all simple drugs, specific powers or virtues can be developed, which act always absolutely and unconditionally, so as to produce in healthy persons definite diseases, the symptoms of which, when similar to those in natural diseases, will cure the latter by removing its symptoms; and that the powers or virtues thus developed increase ad infinitum, in the direct ratio of the mechanical processes and in the indirect ratio of the quantity of the drug, so that their doses can never be chosen too small.

This maxim, if divested from its principal singular conceptions, would have produced much benefit to the profession, and especially to its practice, if Hahnemann could have elevated his mind above his cherished charlatanism, or above his propensity to the grossest absurdities.

Thousands of instances in chemistry prove beyond all doubt that very small quantities of a substance may materially change a disproportionate large quantity of another, if both or one of them are in a liquid state;—corpora non agunt nisi fluida.—The manner in

which such phenomena occur, justifies the opinion, that whenever an affinity or some active relation between two or more substances exists, this action will begin immediately after the two substances, however disproportionate in quantity, come in contact or within their mutual sphere of action, though these changes appear to us to begin only when coming within the limits of our senses. We should perceive these changes much earlier and in a much higher degree of dilution, if our senses were less limited and if the minute changes in colour could be made more perceptible by a chromoscope, as those in size are by a microscope. If for instance, in a solution of a salt of Platina a visibly changed colour is produced by a reagent weighing only the millionth part of the former, we may conjecture that this change has taken place long before it was visible, and in the immediate sphere of the mutual action of both substances. The same will be the case with the slightest vapour of Iodine upon a disproportionately large quantity of starch, or with the smallest quantity of arsenic, capable of making brittle a proportionately large quantity of gold, the most ductile metal. Daily experience, especially in the practice of medicine, proves still more clearly, that the smallest particles contained even in the vapour or gas of substances, produce in the healthy as well as in the diseased state, in men as well as in animals, very remarkable phenomena and even sudden death, although their weight and bulk cannot be distantly compared with the weight and bulk of the individual upon whom they operate; their effect can be referred only to the dynamical processes in organized living bodies, by which the influence of the smallest particle of the substances upon any point of the living body, capable of becoming excited by and of reacting upon it, suddenly spreads over the whole body. Thus if the largest animal sinks lifeless to the ground by the least approach of the vapour of prussic acid to its nose, or if persons become instantaneously giddy, asthmatic, &c., by merely smelling of Veratrine for a moment, these effects cannot result from the weight and bulk of the substances mentioned, but are only the consequences of the deleterious dynamo-chemical processes excited and propagated by them. Future advances in anatomy, physiology, and particularly in chemistry, in their paths now so brilliantly paved, will probably demonstrate, that the electro-chemical processes and the nervous system as the principal conductor in the animal economy, take, if not the only, certainly the principal part in these phenomena.

All these experiments, however, do not vary from the law of nature, that wherever different matters act upon one another chemically or otherwise, by immediate contact (if this can be admitted,) or at a certain distance, they always act in the direct, but never in the inverse ratio of their bulk and weight, or in such a manner that a smaller quantity would produce under similar circumstances a greater effect than a larger one. We may therefore also expect with the greatest propriety, that under identical circumstances, we shall see also identical phenomena, and where this appears different to us, we may justly presume that the circumstances were not identical, and that some other influences beyond the control of our perception have co-operated, but we can by no means account for it by the inverse ratio between cause and its effect.

Contrary to this general law of nature, Hahnemann's conceptions about his developement of virtues from drugs, admit no other explanation than that the powers of the drugs are really not only increased by his singular manipulations, but that they are developed by them in the inverse ratio of their weight and bulk. Though this will become still more evident in the progress of this discussion, we must direct the particular attention of the reader to this topic, not only because it forms one of our principal objections to the homœopathic doses, and therefore particularly to the practical application of this doctrine, but also because the homœopathists will be anxious to prove, that we have committed a palpable and gross error, or have wilfully distorted by sophisms Hahnemann's meanings and intentions.

Hahnemann and his adherents assert, that in applying doses of drugs immensely small and not distantly comparable to those hitherto thought of by any man, it is not the *absolute smallness* of the dose itself which accounts for their miraculous effect, but *the virtue* which becomes developed by the homœopathic triturations and shakings, and that this virtue increases in a direct ratio with the continuation of these manipulations. Now we ask: does this explanation mean anything, except that the power of the drug becomes increased at every higher developement, and that, as a fraction of one per cent. of the different triturations or dilutions of one grain or drop always remains, that also the developed power is absolutely increased in the inverse ratio of its weight? To prove this more clearly, let us take two substances S and s, the for-

mer of which, or S, contains a latent power P (suppose for instance the power or rather the capacity to become ignited,) while the latter, s, is inert and serves only as a vehicle, a menstruum, in short, as a mechanical mean for developing, by triturating or shaking, the power contained in S. Now take a portion of S equal to W and ninety-nine times as much of s, and rub them minutely, or dissolve both and shake them together. After this first trituration, take again one part of this mixture or solution called M, equal to the weight of W, and pulverize or dissolve it again with another ninety-nine parts of s, to obtain a new mixture called m, and so continue and repeat these processes twelve times in the same manner, every one of which must be distinguished by the different letters M, m, μ, &c., when the latent or slumbering P contained in S will be awakened or developed. But in order to use P disenthralled from S, so as to obtain a certain power, (that of igniting) contained in it and not yet enough developed or disenthralled from S, in M, m, μ, &c., you are obliged to continue the same process six times more, in the same manner as you have done twelve times. Is it not clear that the power P is not only developed from S, but that this is done in the inverse ratio between W and P, or between the weight and power of S ; since from the billionth part of one grain a power is developed which was not observable in the one-hundredth, one-ten-thousandth, &c. part of the diminished weight, and much less in the original weight, or in the first W of S. That in order to obtain the proper first developement of P, it has been necessary to repeat the same process with one fractional part of the M, m, μ, &c, and ninety-nine times as much of the menstruum s, proves already the correctness of our assertion, and a fortiori this is correct, when from the first developements until the acquisition of the desired end, many more additional processes, instituted exactly in the same manner, were indispensably required. The subterfuge of "greater mildness," the terms "virtue" "potenz," or similar vague expressions used by Hahnemann and his disciples, cannot impair the clear conception of a power indefinitely increased in the manner just stated. If it was Hahnemann's intention to give a weaker dose after the developement of the drug-virtue has once begun, for instance, the thousandth part of one grain, it would have been sufficient to divide accordingly one grain of the last mixture, possessed of the desired developed virtue. What other reason can be assigned

for repeating the process so often, except that the virtue in M, m, μ, &c. was *not sufficiently* developed, or, to speak plainly, that the power was not *strong* enough? Must not this ridiculous nonsense of the homœopathists, already so striking, be considered still more so, if they were to assert, that the object of their repeated dilutions, shakings and triturations, is to develope always less of P, and thus gradually to approach the *infinite minus* or *nothing*?

The infinite divisibility of all matter does not involve Hahnemann's conception, that the limits of all matter must be no matter at all, or, according to the dynamistical theory, that all matter must be considered only as the product of two powers;—the general attractive and repulsive powers of nature, similar, but opposed in their determined direction, and therefore restricting one another, so as to produce matter by this mutual restriction only. This opinion, so much advocated by Hahnemann, and superficially alluded to in some passages of his works, though contradicting his whole doctrine, will never be proved satisfactorily, since in physical nature we never find matter without power, or power without matter, and the adoption of a superphysical power, though intimately connected with our higher existence and destination, with our happiness on earth and our hopes of the future, belongs to another sphere.

If therefore the author of the Concise View states, in the sense of his master, (see p. 20), that drugs not only become *divested* of *all* qualities belonging to matter by homœopathical dilutions and triturations, but are transformed into *mere virtues*, which, according to our argument, must always act inversely to the original weight of the drug: then these developed drug-virtues would, by this property alone, appear as novelties, since we know of no other power in physical nature depending upon, or at least connected with matter, as all are, which act in this manner: and even the action of all matters, erroneously considered as imponderabilia, such as light, caloric, and electricity, depend in a *direct* ratio upon their measurable quantities.

Wherever we can observe the action of one substance upon another, we will always find them acting in a definite peculiar manner, which is alike in *all their quantities*, and which differs only according to the *direct* ratio of the latter. This *absolutely direct* ratio, it is true, becomes essentially changed by the reac-

tion of the vital powers, and cannot be considered as always depending solely on the changes in the weight of the substances: it forms, however, an essential part of the total action originally resulting from both, viz. from the *definite* weight and the vital reaction.

Hahnemann asserts, on § 282 of his Organon, that the arithmetical proportion is not applicable to the effect of drugs, since eight drops of any medicine cannot be considered, in regard to its effect on the living body, as four times two, but only perhaps as twice two. But he palpably contradicts this assertion, by his repeated direction *always* to administer the thirtieth developed virtue of his drug: and besides, he is only partly correct, in confounding the *absolute* and *relative* differences of the dose of a drug; for when it is first applied to two persons of the same age, sex, constitution, etc. in short, under the same circumstances, the absolute dose must unquestionably be correct, and eight drops will always exert an effect as strong again as four. But under different circumstances, among which we may particularly advert to the repeated application of the same drug during the same disease, or by long habit, eight drops of it may not longer be equal to twice four, but may perhaps decrease in their operation to only $= 7 = 6$ or even $= 0$; according to the number of its repetitions and to other circumstances connected with the individual case; as we have already adverted to above, in defence of the necessity of possessing a variety of drugs belonging to the same class, though they apparently act altogether quite alike; as we may, for instance, apply with considerable advantage, in some nervous diseases, a small quantity of one kind of wine, if no effect is caused by another similar, and even weaker kind.

Though the opinion, that the specific quality of drugs becomes quite changed under different circumstances, has caused many errors in practical medicine, and though this peculiarity is considered by Hahnemann as one of the principal arguments of his doctrine, still the contrary of his assertions will be easily proved, by examining more closely some instances quoted by him and his adherents.

We have seen that Hahnemann and Dr. Hering consider the cure of frost-bitten limbs by means of snow, and the application of heat to burns, as very effectual, and as of the most striking facts in favour of homœopathia. We have also tried to prove, by the principles of rational medicine, the untenable ground on which

these experiences rest. Caloric presents, however, some other phenomena, which not less apparently confirm the erroneous opinion, that its effects on the living body are entirely different, or even opposite, according to its different degrees. Every one must admit, that we are entirely ignorant of *absolute* cold and heat, and are acquainted only with those degrees which we can ascertain.—Should the influence of cold and warmth on the human body be really so opposite, these different effects must of course become most prominent in their greatest known extremes. But as both these extremes produce the same effect on the living animal body, we may justly presume, that wherever the lower degrees of warmth and cold prove to be contrary in their effects, this contrariety is to be explained in a manner *not discordant* with their absolute physical identity, but rather modified only by the specific laws of organized life. Now we observe, that one of the highest degrees of heat which we possess, the white heat of iron, or the focus of a burning glass, produces the same effect on the body as one of the highest degrees of cold, frozen mercury; both exciting, if applied to the living body, violent inflammation and immediate mortification.*

Not content with the mere observation of these identical phenomena, we may easily find the true cause of them in the laws always obvious in caloric, viz. that it tends to be distributed in all bodies equally, and in proportion to their specific capacity for it. The white-hot iron, imparting at once a larger quantity of caloric than the living part in contact with it can distribute so quickly, causes inflammation in this spot, which subsequently mortifies;—the frozen mercury does the same, but only in another direction: it absorbs the caloric so violently from the place of its contact, that an immense quantity of caloric suddenly rushes from the contiguous and all the other parts of the living body, to balance the loss of the caloric absorbed by the frozen mercury: the excessive quantity of caloric, thus momentarily accumulated at the points of contact, produces the same effect, and causes the spot to inflame: this spot likewise, by its great degree of over-excitement, passes quickly to the state of death, or mortification. If the dif-

* It appears that the ancients had a clear conception of the identical action of the highest degrees of heat and cold, since we find in Pliny, Horace, and Cicero, the expression "frigus urit."

ference between the free caloric contained in two bodies is not very great, and consequently if the tendency to a free distribution of it is not excessive, the colder one applied will always abstract caloric from the warmer body, but less quickly than where the difference is greater. This fact is confirmed in many other natural phenomena: for instance, in the two electricities, where also the effect, in combining them, will be greater or less, in proportion to the difference of the degree of plus E in the one and of minus E in the other.—It generally appears a law of nature, that wherever two opposite powers, or two opposite directions of the same power act, the rapidity of their mutual tendency to combine, and to restore the disturbed equilibrium is always in direct proportion to their different degrees*.

The profession formerly considered cold an astringent, on account of its physical contracting quality; afterwards as a stimulant, and now, with more propriety, as the contrary, or as a powerful antiphlogistic. As a mere astringent it will never act on the tissues of the living body, because no physical power can act absolutely

* We find but few similar physical phenomena apparently contradicting this law, which depends on causes not yet satisfactorily ascertained; since the same cause, when reduced to its lower degree, cannot alone produce what is generally effected by its higher degrees. Thus it is observed, that when the mercury in the thermometer has fallen to the freezing point of water, an increase of cold causes it to rise a little for a short time. Though this may be partly explained by the cold, contracting unequally the mercury and the glass, yet it is remarkable, that all things having been equal before the level of the mercury had reached the freezing point, its falling was always in a direct proportion to the diminished degree of warmth. Water, as stated by modern experimentalists, does not present this contradictory property, but augments in its density always in direct proportion to the degree of cold; it appears, therefore, still more extraordinary, that water evaporates on white-hot iron less than at the lower degrees of heat; and though naturalists have explained this by the influence of electro-magnetism which becomes developed, the fact that alcohol also evaporates more at some lower degrees of warmth than at higher ones, also remains unexplained. These experiments, which we have not seen quoted by Dr. Metcalf, in his New Theory of Terrestrial Magnetism, just published,—in connexion with other facts, especially with these, that magnetism is not communicated uniformly like caloric, and does not impart its fluid or magnetic power to bodies susceptible for it, etc.---may form a part of the many objections to his theory, to which more competent critics may advert. Many phenomena, however, attending the origin and cure of diseases may favour, if not the absolute identity of caloric and magnetism, (which proposition once admitted, would likewise imply the identity of caloric and electricity) but, at least, their mutual dependance, or their always contemporary action.—When considering that habit or custom plays so great a part in the living animal economy, being one of the most prominent prerogatives of organized life, it appears highly interesting that the magnet is the only one of all unorganized substances, which likewise depends on habit or custom, though generally in a proportion inverse to the influence of habit in organized living bodies, the magnetic power (reaction) being gradually increased by habit. This similarity may hereafter open a large field for some interesting physiological researches, as it may best explain the mysterious phenomena of animal magnetism; much more so, since animal magnetism is likewise the only agent which increases in its action by habit.

on it so long as it lives or is capable of any reaction, though the tela cellulosa as the most simple, least sensible and most vegetative tissue of the living animal body, appears to be most affected by the astringent powers of cold; but the higher and lower degrees of cold will operate sometimes as antiphlogistic, and sometimes as stimulant, according to its absolute degree, and also to the degree of heat of the part to which it is applied. If the part be very hot from genuine or plastic inflammatien, ice may easily injure, though a less intense degree of cold may be beneficial, because when ice is applied, more caloric goes to the part, which already superabounds in it, than is in the same time directly absorbed by the ice, whereas a less intense cold will absorb the heat of the inflamed part without that inconvenience. But if the part be only very hot from a large local developement of caloric, not depending on a genuine inflammation, as is the case in all pure asthenic or adynamic fevers, typhus, &c., or from a tendency to an inorganic chemical decomposition, as is obvious in the last stages of putrid fevers, ice may prove highly salutary, by operating as an indirect powerful stimulant, and the lower degrees of cold may prove detrimental, its direct noxious influence being not overbalanced by its indirect stimulus. This might become more evident in considering that the intense heat perceptible in patients dangerously ill with typhus, and particularly with putrid fever, (the very *causus*) does not depend on the *vital* developement of caloric, attending all plastic processes, and therefore superabundantly increased, as in all genuine inflammations, but upon an opposite and rather *passive* process, predominant in all those kinds of diseases, as far as life admits of a tendency to inorganic decomposition of the solids and fluids, by which caloric also becomes always developed; this may be proved by the characteristic heat of the patient, (calor mordax) which will be observed in these diseases only, but never in those where the vital powers are not so intensely reduced, and much less in any genuine inflammatory affection. In typhus fever, with dangerous affections of the brain, delirium ferox or taciturnum, sopor, &c., and in which the cautious but energetic treatment with stimulants, revulsives, &c. is generally indicated, fomentations of the head with cold water will be of more injury than benefit to the patient, whereas bladders filled with pounded ice are a powerful remedy and has saved the lives of many such patients; because in these cases it does not operate as an antiphlo-

gistic, as is thought generally, but as a powerful indirect stimulant upon this centre of the nervous reaction, the brain; promoting a larger afflux of caloric to it, which, by encouraging a salutary reaction, amply overbalances the direct deduction of stimulus by cold.

The manner in which caloric acts on organized living bodies, offers highly instructive instances, particularly adapted for the satisfactory explanation of many phenomena in animal life, and as the great astronomer discovered the laws of gravitation from the fall of an apple, so the reflecting physiologist may, from the few remnants of life contained in a frozen apple, which are revived by snow and the gradual application of warmth, but destroyed for ever by its higher degrees, derive results highly important to theoretical as well as practical medicine.*

* The explanation of the action of caloric on the living organized body contained in these pages, relieves us from further objections to this argument which Hahnemann alleges in support of his maxim, "similia similibus curantur," saying in §61 of his Organon; that the one hand bathed in warm water is at first warmer than the other, but afterwards if taken out from it feels colder than the other, in consequence of the after-operation of the warm water, and so vice versa if put first into cold water. It is astonishing that a man who pretends to reform or rather to establish the healing art, should be so ignorant as to quote such instances in support of his doctrine. If the thermometer at the temperature of 80 deg. is immersed in cold water of 30 deg. and it falls to this degree; can it be well called an after-operation of warmth, or if taken out of water at 30 deg. and exposed to the temperature of the atmosphere of 70 deg. it rises again to 70 deg., can this rising of 40 deg. be called an after-operation of cold? The feeling of cold after the hand is taken from warm water will, besides the cause quoted by us above, be still more perceptible, because the increased warmth has, according to the law of organized living bodies, "ubi irritatio ibi affluxus humorum" attracted more fluids, blood, &c., and increases afterwards by the more opened pores, the evaporation, which abstracting caloric, must naturally produce the sensation of cold; whereas when the hand has been before in cold water and is afterwards exposed to a warmer medium, it will increase the sensation of warmth by the increased excitability for all stimulants, and therefore also for warmth. The detrimental action of heat and cold depends much on the state of the person and on the state of the surrounding atmosphere. Weakly persons are unquestionably very much injured by cold, and the use of cold water, now recommended as a remedy in many diseases, and as a preventive against them, produces a great many evils, as do many similar recommendations given under the erroneous impression that they are more congenial to the natural state of men, which has long since passed away. Van Helmont says very correctly, "frigidum non est principium vitale sed extinctionis." Many cases of dyspepsia, rheumatism, &c., and particularly of cough, which turns to consumption, arise frequently from cold water, though sometimes, but rarely, ice may prove a remedy in diseases of the stomach and bowels, for the reason mentioned above when speaking of ice in cerebral-typhus. Hahnemann in his Organon, and also in his Materia Medica, Vol. II., asserts, that when a person much heated feels cold by spirituous drinks, and hotter from cold drinks, it depends likewise on a homœopathical action of heat and cold. The fact is true, and would, if more strictly observed, and not abused, prevent many serious and even fatal diseases. It depends however on those laws of organized life, according to which the stimulus must be always proportionate to the degree of excitability, if the vital actions shall not be disturbed, &c., and also on the fact best explained by them, that all extremes, if they follow one another immediately, injure and can even destroy the structure of all bodies, but particularly organized living ones, since the equilibrium of the vital powers, easily sustained or restored during a gradual change, cannot be established so quickly in a sudden one. It is therefore also very erroneous to consider merely the sudden transition from warmth to cold obnoxious; the reverse is not less so, and many dangerous diseases of children,

The operations of many other agents and drugs, producing as well as curing sickness, according to the difference of their dose, are however to be considered the same. A slight cold, for instance, may check the secretion of the Schneiderian membrane and cause a dry catarrh ; one which is severer at the commencement, or follows the first, may excite this membrane to a profuse secretion ; and a similar but more severe affection will check the secretion again from the same cause, but being more intense than in both the previous cases, it may generate by over-excitement, an inflammation extending to the throat, the trachea and even to the lungs. The cause of all these different states is always *the same* and acts in the *same* manner, but either under different circumstances or in different degrees of strength, and nobody can reasonably assert, that in the third degree of the action just mentioned, the same cause had *cured* homœopathically what a minor degree in the second stage of the same disease had previously produced. As instances of simple drugs, we may cite Rhubarb, Ipecacuanha and Opium. Rhubarb is acknowledged to be a purgative in large doses, but small doses of it are beneficial in looseness of the bowels. It is not yet ascertained, but we are confident, that many other purgatives, especially those which are considered as tonics, would do the same under certain circumstances, if used in doses small enough in proportion to their purgative quality, without regard to the homœopathic

particularly croup, inflammation of the brain, &c., arise from their approach to the fire when they have been before exposed to cold air. Cold can be applied without injury only in a very few diseases, though sometimes very desperate cases are cured by it, especially by alternately sudden changes of temperature; as all agents which are capable of doing great injury, are also sometimes of great benefit; thus for instance, tic douloureux (prosopalgia,) is sometimes cured merely by sudden alternate applications of hot water and ice, though this disease is so painful and obstinate that such patients submit to the most painful surgical operations, rather than to suffer the pains, which however frequently resist all medical and surgical assistance. Persons who are accustomed to sudden changes of temperature will bear them much easier without injury, and are much more protected against many morbid affections than others, because the particular influence of habit belongs to the most prominent and characteristical properties of organized living bodies. It should therefore be considered as one of the most important object s of a judicious physical education of children, to accustom them, from their earliest infancy, to alternate changes by baths gradually, with other circumspective precautions. The Russian baths, now so fashionable in Europe, may therefore be very much recommended for young and healthy persons, to harden them to the vicissitudes of atmospheric temperature, and may also be considered as a powerful remedy in some inveterate chronic diseases, in which a torpor of reaction prevails, as in gout, some nervous affections, &c.; provided there are no local affections of internal organs, especially those where plethora predominates ; but when used without due precaution, they sometimes prove highly obnoxious and even fatal. This is easily explained when we reflect that even lifeless bodies, possessing the greatest cohesion, for instance a large piece of flint, which may have resisted all influences in nature for thousands of years, falls immediately into dust, when after exposure to a high degree of heat, it is thrown into cold water. How much more will man be affected by a sudden sequel of both extremes, if not very healthy, strong, and accustomed to it.

maxim. These different and contrary actions may be easily explained physiologically in the following manner, without the aid of homœopathia, and rather in opposition to its maxims, viz.; in a large dose they over-excite the mucous membrane of the intestines, and the subsequent relaxation produces a larger excretion of fluids, already attracted by the increased specific stimulus; whereas, in a reasonable small dose, their primary effect remains weaker and the natural consequences of the over-excitement and relaxation mentioned, are not only absent, but, on the contrary, if such a relaxation has previously existed, as is the case in a protracted diarrhœa, it will be diminished and cured. A relatively small dose of rhubarb, or of another purgative, might always produce costiveness by that reason also, because, before it reaches the large intestines, it operates on the stomach and small intestines, their nerves, &c., where, as a slight stimulus, it produces an antagonistical reaction, and checks the secretion in the lower parts of the intestinal tube, in a manner discordant with Hahnemann's rude conceptions of this very allopathic mode, and more similar to Rasori's theory of contra-stimulus. Ipecacuanha also, like other emetics, if given in very small doses, may check a hyperemesis, which has resisted the best remedies known, because, as is ascertained by the interesting experiments of Magendie, the action of emetics depends particularly on their influence upon the par vagum and its continuance in, and ultimate connexion with, the nerves of the stomach.—In a morbid distemper, however, of this section of the nervous system, causing a particular morbid reaction of the stomach, small doses of Ipecacuanha will check vomiting, as well as many substances which otherwise would have checked it, will increase it. Obstinate cases of vomiting or purging will sometimes be quickly cured by sufficiently powerful emetics or cathartics, after all other remedies have failed, simply because they remove not a remote, but a proximate cause; for instance the remnants of indigestible food, which nature alone could not remove on account of her too tardy and weak action; by every slight and useless exertion, the evil still increases, while on the contrary, by the aid of a powerful remedy, causing a very brisk reaction, the patient is cured by removing the material cause.—In all these cases we purposely abstracted from the indirect removal of such a disease, by changing only *the form* of the present state, or by substituting a new order of things which, though aggravated, does not allow the prominent cause

and its symptom to exist any longer.—Opium in small doses is an excellent remedy in looseness of the bowels, but large doses of it may produce diarrhœa by over-exciting the ganglions, nerves, &c. of the intestinal canal, which therefore is very difficult to cure, as are all diseases which originate from repeated over-excitements, and particularly, all diseases following habitual intemperance in spirituous drinks. A small dose of opium, as we have already hinted, may, however, render radical relief in obstinate costiveness, and act as a purgative where all drugs considered as purgatives have failed, by removing the nervous anæsthesia, or the particular distemper, (paræsthesia) which prevents the natural functions from being performed, and renders also cathartics ineffectual.

To prove that influences belonging to the same class, or even identical, may cause quite opposite actions, we refer also to mental influences, which merely differ in their strength and not in their nature, or depend also upon individual predisposition. In this manner the relief which the slightly affected heart feels in shedding tears, is denied to the sufferer of a greater misfortune or when possessed of more sensitive and deeper feelings.—In all these instances no one of sound conception will find any thing *similar* to a homœopathic action of exceedingly small doses *opposite* to their action in comparatively very large ones, but all phenomena minutely correspond with the principles of sound physiology and rational medicine.

Sometimes the great influence of a small dose, and the efficacy of a comparatively very large one, solely depend upon the still more evident local vital reaction. Thus a few grains of arsenic or of any strong poison may be more fatal than an ounce of the same substance taken at a dose, only because the large dose excites so powerful and quick a reaction of the stomach, that there is then more chance of the rejection of all its contents, than when only a few grains are taken, which might sit on the stomach and destroy life. Even on superficial reference to such a fact, nobody would think that arsenic is to be considered as acting in the inverse ratio of its bulk and weight. Every one will admit that one ounce of arsenic divided into grains will poison, without any particular virtue developed by an homœopathic manipulation, and that the true nature of this substance, though operating more unconditionally than many, is not in the least changed by the difference of

the dose itself, but that its effect depends on particular conditions. All the substances which do not act mechanically, operate on the living animal body only relatively, and though they operate as remedies in direct proportion to their quantity and quality, they never act unconditionally and absolutely, as Hahnemann asserts in respect to his virtues developed from drugs. We may say with propriety that, excepting the primitive eternal cause of all nature, no power acts absolutely and unconditionally; but that all are wisely counterbalanced and checked by one another, and that this produces principally the immense variety of actions in the universe. Every man therefore who believes or asserts that a power, developed by him, acts absolutely and unconditionally, the same under all circumstances, and without being checked or altered by the influence of any natural power, may justly be considered as destitute of common sense, and of all natural religious feeling. It is evident that, if this bold and often repeated assertion of Hahnemann be true, we cannot conceive why, among many other inconsistencies of a similar kind, Hahnemann makes the salutary operations of his developed drug-virtues to depend upon the absence of all remedial influences to which the patient may be exposed? why he acknowledges the influence of idiosynocrasy and habit? why he so frequently prescribes antidotes in cases where homœopathic doses acted improperly or too violently? why he cautions his followers against undertaking the treatment of a patient who has previously been illtreated by an allopathist? and why, in publishing his "great truth," he himself could ever admit the many failures of his earlier treatment for upwards of twenty years, which, as he himself avows, had induced him to labor twelve years upon another treatment of all chronic diseases—all of which palpably contradict the absolute and unconditional operations of his drug-virtues, though he continues the same assertions in his later works? Is it not the greatest nonsense to stipulate any condition for a power said to act always absolutely and unconditionally?*

"Go teach eternal wisdom how to rule,
"Then drop into thyself and be a fool."—*Pope.*

* As a specimen of the many revolting expressions in regard to the infallibility of their doctrine, with which not only Hahnemann's works, but also those of his disciples abound; we quote the remarks of Dr. Kopp, who states in his work above mentioned, page 487, that Dr. Hartlaub and Dr. Trinks in their Materia Medica, and also in Archiv. f. h. Heilk. Vol. II., No. 3, publicly declare in regard to the infallible cure of hydrophobia by the homœopathic method, "that each unfortunate issue of this

With regard to the *greater mildness* claimed by Hahnemann and the author of the Concise View on page 14, for the homœo-

"shocking disease is always to be ascribed to the attending physician," though we know of *no instance* in which their treatment has succeeded in hydrophobia, but *many* where it has failed.

We are told by good authority, that in an American city, some homœopathists have recently collected the saliva of a rabid dog, probably for no other purpose than to administer it in hydrophobia. We hope they will not be so crazy as to venture its application on healthy persons, for ascertaining the validity of their conceptions about drug-sickness, nor to administer it as a prophylactic in any case, where a person is bitten by a rabid dog. Both, but the former particularly, should be considered as murderous experiments, since according to many instances on record, persons wounded by a dog unquestionably rabid, have escaped without danger. As a homœopathic, or in these cases more particularly termed *isopathic* remedy against hydrophobia itself, the thirtieth dilution of one drop of hydrophobic matter will probably do no positive injury, but would be highly objectionable, merely as causing the neglect of other important measures prescribed by the profession. It appears to us very inconsistent for homœopathists still to trust to the hydrophobic virus, after the "great truth" of their great genius should have taught them that hydrophobia is particularly entitled to all the singular privileges of the itch, and will certainly be radically cured by smelling of a sugar grain as large as a hempseed, and moistened with the thirtieth dilution of table salt.—Sometimes the contemptible "learned lumber" would aid them a little. In this case, for instance, they would then know that there are many reasons for believing that the hydrophobia of animals depends on the twin-brother of itch, viz. on alopecia or leprosis, which is particularly common to the genus canis, to the fox, wolf, &c.

We do not despair of the curability of this tremendous scourge, though we must candidly confess that allopathists, rational as well as empirical, have hitherto succeeded so seldom, that it may justly be still declared incurable by them. In these cases modern medicine has likewise tried in vain to apply its all-curing antiphlogistic treatment to the utmost extreme. Bleeding, ad deliquium, was frequently prescribed, but to our knowledge without one instance of a positive benefit. We should think that without a chemical destruction or neutralization of such a violent and unassimilable virus, and without an energetic though cautious support of the vital powers, either to subdue its effects or to convey it to the primarily affected place, where it can be discharged by the excretory organs, all the exertions of the art must prove fruitless, and that therefore, so long as we do not possess a distinct antidote, the method which tends to prostrate to the utmost all vital actions, must be considered the worst of all. The inferences drawn from the inflammation of the par vagum and of the other nerves and ganglia of the neck, the throat, &c., as derived from some post mortem examinations of hydrophobic persons, cannot reasonably justify such an extreme antiphlogistic treatment, even if we were certain that the inflammatory state should have existed at all, or at a still higher degree during life. It would be difficult to comprehend how an inflammation, existing in the finest nets of the capillary arteries, veins and lymphatics, could be subdued by an abstraction of blood, not only on account of the physical laws of capillarity, but also by the violent stimulus of such a heterogeneous virus. Even admitting the truth of modern physiological experiments and also of observations in diseases, that by large bleedings the resorption is promoted more than by any other remedy; we would ask, is it probable that such a pernicious virus will be resorbed by the vasa absorbentia, then pass through the whole circulation, and then again be deposited in a secretory and excretory organ,—which processes the virus must necessarily undergo before it can be removed,—without doing, if possible, still more injury, than when remaining in the said places? The analogy drawn from the benefits generally derived from an antiphlogistic treatment in infectious exanthematic diseases like small-pox, measles, &c. is not applicable to hydrophobia, since in these diseases the cutaneous inflammation being more or less considerably extended, and the function of such a large emunctory organ, as the whole skin, is much restricted, the antiphlogistic treatment is not only more necessary, but this must be also of a more prominent influence; farther, in these exanthematic diseases the virus is more diffused over the whole reproductive system, and becomes gradually assimilated by the different stages of the disease; and lastly, this method of treatment proves injurious in those cases also if carried too far, or if the disease is complicated with nervous affec-

pathically developed drug-virtues, we would further remark, that if his statement be correct, it involves consistently the assertion,

tions, &c. The great similarity between hydrophobia and the most dangerous and fatal nervous affections, particularly trismus and tetanus; the fact that distinct symptoms of spontaneous hydrophobia are sometimes seen as accessories in important nervous affections, for instance in typhus and intermittent fever, &c., favour the opinion that hydrophobia is a most violent disease of the nervous system, seated probably most prominently in the upper part of the spinal marrow and the medulla oblongata, the canalis cerebro-spinalis Magendii, the ganglion intercaroticum, (?) &c. The attention of the profession should therefore be particularly directed to those remedies which act principally on the whole nervous system, and particularly on the spinal marrow, rather than to any other mode, provided the utmost perseverance in the judicious local treatment of the wound by stimulants and suppuratives, which should always be regarded as the principal object, is carefully observed.

The treatment of the older schools with belladonna, meloe proscarabæus, cantharides, &c., would, perhaps, have succeeded better if attended with the proper local treatment of the wound, and the simultaneous use of large doses of mercury. The powerful alcaloides discovered by modern chemistry in the articles mentioned, and in other drugs, as Veratrine, particularly their endermic application, open a large field for trials, which, if duly and perseveringly continued, may grant us the great victory over this scandalum medicorum. We may justly attribute the failure hitherto attending the use of these drugs, in their external exhibition, to the erroneous opinion that it makes no difference in what manner they are applied externally, and that the dilated wound is the best place to apply them; this, however, is not the proper endermic treatment, and contradicts the known fact, that the absorbent vessels and the nerves are generally more numerous and active on the surface of the skin, immediately below the epidermis, than in the depth of the muscles; it is also evident that the influence of the drugs is either frustrated by the torpor or morbid process of the primitive lesion, or will be destroyed by the necessary dilatation of the wound and its suppuration, by which they are also soon removed. It is obvious that both objects cannot be attained in the same place, and that, as the local suppuration is intended to remove the virus, the endermic remedy cannot enter the system by absorption on the same spot simultaneously.—Why has not the profession continued to try hot vapour baths, (108° F.) by which Dr. Brisson intended to kill himself, but was cured by them, when the symptoms of hydrophobia were already developed? Ten years ago Dr. B. communicated this and many similar statements of brilliant cures to the Academie des Sciences at Paris; such a mode is, moreover, very consistent with rational principles; among which we may particularly advert to the fact, that idiopathic hydrophobia affects exclusively animals which do not perspire by the skin, and yet it is totally neglected. We venture also to suggest that electricity, and particularly the intense galvanism of a Voltaic pile, might be tried with success, when persevered in, since it would offer the most efficacious means for revulsing the morbid process, and perhaps the virus itself, from the affected parts of the spinal marrow, the nerves and their ganglions, to the place of its original seat, and possibly, destroy there best chemically the hydrophobic matter. If even many of these trials fail, the profession should not act as is common with many remedies newly recommended, and after considering them as all-curing medicines for a short time, reject them too soon; but should continue the experiments in other places, under the correct supposition, that we know as yet but little about the functional and sympathetical connexions of the nervous system, particularly of the immense variety of its diseases, and that at the distance of only half a geometrical line, or still less, an experiment might succeed when it had failed so near this spot.—Our opposers, the homœopathists, might perhaps conclude from our objections made at the beginning of this note, and from many other expressions in these pages, where we confess our great regard to the smallest quantities of a virus or of a remedy, that we act with inconsistency or duplicity in being directly in favour of their whimsical doses of drugs, though directly opposed to them. But every rational physician will be in favor of small doses under particular circumstances, and when they are within the bounds of reason; so too every one will admit that an inconsiderably *small* power added to a *large* one may be the principal cause of an effect, but that this does not justify us in considering the small power as *absolutely larger* than it really is. A vat of a capacity of thousands of hogsheads may overflow by one drop only, but does this imply that one drop alone is sufficient to fill it?

that the drug has become changed into another substance, since it is not proper to say, that one-eighth of a grain of opium acts *more mildly* than a whole grain of it when taken at once, but only that its *specific action* will be less, when compared with another similar substance, for instance, with the extract of Henbane (Hyoscyamus niger, L.); we can only say this acts more mildly, though no physician would doubt that a sufficiently large quantity of the latter will prove more injurious than a very small quantity of opium. Thus also nobody would say that the electric fluid acts on the human body more mildly than light, because the former developed from a small piece of sealing-wax produces no effect, but intense light destroys the sight:—such minute, though not subtle distinctions, materially affect the principles of practical medicine, and hence, in so important a science, we should leave no expression of that kind without a clear conception, nor should vague productions of the imagination be confounded with abstract ideas and the results of true experience, on which all medicine rests.

If Hahnemann had offered the profession new and unknown drugs for definite diseases, and had stated that, according to repeated experiments instituted by him with the greatest accuracy, and even under the injunction that such drugs should not be given in larger doses than the billionth, or a similar fraction of a grain, and that the grain must be divided exactly in such or such a peculiar manner, &c., no one could, with propriety, object a priori, and the correctness of these statements would depend upon fair trials. If they were proved to be correct, by repeated and careful experiments, then another question would arise, whether they could or could not be explained by acknowledged laws of nature. When, at a minute scrutiny, they are found to be totally at variance with such laws and with those of the human intellect, still no man of sound judgment would forthwith adopt one or more *supernatural* powers or *miracles* as the causes of these phenomena, since he would be reminded, that at least in this world, all natural phenomena depend on *fixed* laws engrafted upon nature by the infinite wisdom of her eternal Creator, and that many phenomena, which appeared to our ancestors as supernatural, are now referred with mathematical exactitude to definite laws, depending upon or intimately connected with the universal laws of nature; he would accept with gratitude such discoveries, and confessing his ignorance of the natural cause, he would feel in duty bound to use them wherever it appeared to him necessary or salutary. But if we are told by

Hahnemann, that drugs, which have been used daily for centuries by thousands of trustworthy physicians, and in different countries by grains, drachms and ounces, in powders, infusions, decoctions, &c., not only *without any* injury, and without observing *one* of the many symptoms which Hahnemann and his followers pretend *always* to observe, but frequently with the most salutary effect; if we are told that *the same* drugs have always proved detrimental, if given in larger doses than the many thousand-millionth part of one grain, ever since Hahnemann has pursued a mode of treatment different from that which he himself, for upwards of thirty years had followed on a *much larger* scale than most other practitioners; if further the same man tells us, that substances, *daily* used by ounces or pounds, by men and animals as *indispensable* for their life and health, become transmuted into *violent* drugs, of which even the smallest imaginable fraction of one grain may produce *great injury* or benefit, and that such fractions of one grain of a substance obtain this power by certain processes, hitherto also justly considered incapable of changing *in the least* the property belonging to any substance;—then we have full cause to suspect the grossest errors or premeditated imposition, especially when all these statements come from a man like Samuel Hahnemann, who has been guilty of the greatest charlatanism and intentional falsehoods.* His trials with simple drugs on healthy

* The history of man presents us with many instances, where great discoveries have been disregarded, ridiculed and even persecuted, although made by truly great men, who have advanced their age for centuries; the history of all sciences proves that truth, like the noble fruit, requires to be carefully cultivated and fostered, whereas error, credulity and superstition, like rank weeds, spontaneously and luxuriantly spread over the fields. The same instructive source sadly teaches us, that mankind generally weighed truth and falsehood, not according to their intrinsic worth, but only to the majority of votes, or the number of years which they have lasted, quite unmindful, that as lead will never change into gold by the decision of any large majority or by any length of time, just so a falsehood will never become true. But, nevertheless no scientific fanaticism ever ventured so far, as to compare the grossest whims and absurdities proclaimed so palpably by Hahnemann, with the discoveries and merits of a Galileo and Columbus. It would be tedious to enlarge more on this subject here, by further quotations from many places in Hahnemann's works, where he states that all drugs hitherto used in common doses, act absolutely as poisons and are harmless only once in many hundred cases. Well educated, intelligent and honest professional men who read his works attentively, will find our statement confirmed; and any body can easily imagine how such assertions must naturally appear to men, who, beside their study of practical medicine, have for many years daily used the same drugs in the largest doses with unquestionable benefit, both when diseased themselves and with their patients, and who have also seen, in many cases, the insufficiency and failures of the homœopathic treatment, and the injury which is frequently caused by the neglect of homœopathists, in not administering proper and timely aid. The manner in which Hahnemann and his adherents endeavour to defend such failures is indeed exceedingly ridiculous and contemptible, as the instances already quoted by us above will have sufficiently proved; but, nevertheless, the following is worth remarking: Hahnemann, in his Materia Medica, Vol. III. p. 6, where he challenges his

persons, though they are not of *his* invention and have led him to the most superstitious and absurd conclusions, may, nevertheless, be interesting to the profession, if impartially instituted in the sense suggested above, and deserve therefore to be continued even with many of such drugs as are condemned by him. His maxim, similia similibus curantur, and even his marvelous itch-doctrine, with all its gross absurdities and contradictions, might at least admit some conjectures, which do not differ so widely from other fanciful theories and suggestions recorded in the history of medicine, though never expressed with such a total disregard of truth, with such unblushing self-conceit, such a contempt of all other experience, and with such an unparalleled charlatanism in the promises of a never-failing medical omniscience and certainty of cure;—but Hahnemann's assertions about the virtues developed from simple drugs by manipulations of *his* invention, and his statements of what has been observed *only by him and his followers*, oblige us

disciples and followers to expose homœopathia to public contempt, by placing before the public all the particulars legally confirmed, *if his prescriptions, though minutely observed, had failed*, cunningly adds in italics, "BUT HAVE ALSO ALL OTHER REMEDIAL "INFLUENCES REMOVED FROM THE PATIENT." It is evident that by this condition alone no failure whatever of a homœopathist can possibly be proved, since, as we have seen above, according to his doctrine, every thing may be considered as a remedial influence, if $\frac{1}{10^{60}}$ of one grain of common table salt should act so powerfully on the human body, cases may occur, that in which it is sufficient *merely to smell* of a sugar-pellet, not larger than a hemp-seed, moistened with such a dilution; or if, as we have seen in Dr. Hering's Concise View, *even parsley* distinctly belongs to the class of *important* remedial agents. What patient would be able conscientiously to deny that he has not been in contact with some table salt, or has not been exposed to the influence of some homœopathic remedial substance, as parsley, sulphur? &c. Another piece of cunning advice of Hahnemann to his followers is, as we have seen, that they should avoid the treatment of patients who have ever been under the care of a murderous allopathist, since this may frustrate all their exertions. Now, who could comply with such conditions, and, if he could, the infatuated homœopathist would not believe it, but would persuade his patient, that his memory was treacherous, and that, not long since, he must have taken a few grains of calomel, or that he must have recently smelled sulphur, belladonna, must have passed near some place where the thorn-apple or even roses grow, &c.—We know some very amusing instances in which, after these magicians could not succeed with all their developed virtues, they insisted upon their subterfuge, that the patient must absolutely be under the influence of a remedial agent, which counteracted and frustrated their *absolutely* and *unconditionally* acting and *never-failing* drug-virtues. In one such case, related to us by a respectable and trust-worthy physician, a patient, who had been persuaded by the same half-witted German merchant, mentioned above, to consult the homœopathic doctor for some chronic disease, became daily worse, and was at last confined to his room. When one day the doctor visited him, just as he was lighting his cigar with a small match; the doctor observing it, exclaimed, with a serious face and with great pathos, "Now I see why my exertions are "in vain; my suspicions are now confirmed; you are under the remedial influence of "sulphur, which must counteract all my best selected remedies; this is unquestion-"ably the only reason why you do not recover!" The patient, already tired of all the "trifles and niceties never heard of before," applied to a common allopathist, who fortunately soon cured him, in spite of the continued remedial agency of the sulphur on a match.

either to declare them gross falsehoods, or to renounce all truth hitherto acknowledged and even confirmed by mathematical calculations, and believe implicitly in supernatural powers and miracles at the disposal of man.

We see indeed no other chance, not merely with regard to medicine alone, but also generally to the laws of the human understanding, and to those derived from all the minute researches of natural philosophy and the many sciences and arts connected with them. We can prove these, our assertions, from Dr. Hering's pamphlet, where we read, on page 14, "Medicines which had "undergone these operations no longer possessed those long conti- "nued effects of a prejudicial character, which we so frequently have "to witness from crude articles. Their operation is always rapid, "of short continuance, and without danger, &c. Moreover, these "dilutions were thus extraordinary small in appearance only; "they were in fact operative by reason of the pure energy proper "to the medicine developed by art, and not by reason of the original "matter of it. Hence they could not be too small or too weak; for "it was shown in a manner not to be mistaken, that the proper "medicinal virtue was by no means diminished in them, but, in "their lower grades it was at first unfolded and developed, and it "was only by their continuation that it began again to decrease. "But as regards its capability of exciting the organization to salu- "tary action, there was never any diminution, it was still witnessed, "even though the dilutions were continued, until they reached "some hundreds in number. In the higher dilutions, however, it "was so modified as more quickly to excite the organization to "opposition, but the opposition continued for a short time." And on page 20, "By means of these *triturations* and *dilutions*, so called, "it was the *matter* only which became so minutely divided, but it "was the energy, the *virtue* only which was thereby so astonish- "ingly unfolded, &c.;" and ibid, "when the process of Trituration "or Agitation was too long continued, the energy of the medicine "became too intensely raised," &c. And again on page 28, "when "no relief whatever is possible, they do no injury." Though we have already determined what the proper meaning of the *largest* or *smallest* homœopathic doses must be, if there shall be any sense in them; we ask any impartial reader, of common sense, if after the repeated perusal of these quotations, he can comprehend this "*potenzised*" nonsense, and particularly if he can reconcile that one and the

same thing *decreases*, and again becomes *astonishingly unfolded*, so that its energy proves to be *too intensely raised*, and that all this being effected by one and the same process, the final result shall be a power, *much smaller* than it was at the beginning of the processes, *called only* triturations and solutions; what are they then else? Are they not then avowedly witchcraft, chiromancy, &c? But it may be still more illustrating to quote here the master's own remarkable expressions. Hahnemann begins the second volume of his treatise on Chronic Diseases with the following words, "The changes which take place in all natural productions, espe-"cially in drugs, by constant triturations with a substance not "medicinal, or by shaking with a fluid not medicinal, are so in-"credibly great as to be almost miraculous, and it is gratifying "that the discovery of these wonderful changes belongs to homœo-"pathia. The medicinal powers of these substances, as we have "stated elsewhere, are not only developed by it in an unmeasurable "degree, but their chemical and physical conditions are so changed, "that if their solubility in water or alcohol could never before be "perceived in their crude elementary state, they, after their peculiar "metamorphosis, become quite soluble in water or alcohol; a "discovery which I first published to the world!"—We leave it to the fancy of any one to imagine what substance can be *not medicinal*, if *all natural productions* are capable of having a virtue developed from them.—Hahnemann continues to assert not only that by this manner, all substances, like flint, all metals, the pure as well as the sulphuretted and oxydated, become soluble in water or alcohol, but also that they remain unaltered for years in respect to all their singular properties thus acquired, and especially in their particular state, termed by him "*potenzised*." Thus for instance in speaking of *pure* phosphorus, he adds expressly, "I "do not mean its acid;" of course the contrary being the opinion of all "over-refined chemists," who believe phosphorus easily oxydated by, but not soluble in water; it cannot be his opinion. He says farther, loc. cit. "We shall find also in this, their enhanced and "almost glorified state, that no neutralization whatever takes place. "The medical virtues of Natrum, Ammonia, Barytes, Lime and "Magnesia, will in this their highly potenzised state, not perhaps "be neutralized when a dose is taken, as they do in their crude "state as bases, by a drop of vinegar; their medicinal power is "neither to be altered nor annihilated. Nitric acid prepared and

"taken in this manner for the use of homœopathists, in the proper "homœopathic developement and dose, will not become changed "in its strong definite medical action, if Lime or Natrum be taken "afterwards, and therefore will not become neutralized." On page 272, Vol. IV., of the same work, on mentioning the common inoffensive use of table salt, (Natrum muriaticum or Sodæ murias) one of his favorite antipsorics—probably on account of Pliny's statements, who mentions in his natural history, lib. xxxiv. "scabiem pecorum sal tollit."——Hahnemann says, "and yet the "greatest medical virtues are concealed in it. Is it not therefore "evident, even to the most short-sighted, that the peculiar homœo-"pathical preparations of medical substances reveal almost a new "world of powers, which have hitherto remained concealed in "nature; thus by the transmutation of common table salt from "its crude and inactive nature into a violent medicine, it is to be "given after this preparation, with the greatest precaution, to the "diseased person. What an incredible transmutation, and yet "how true! apparently a new creation! The pure table salt "carried in this manner to the decillionth developement of power," ($\frac{1}{10^{60}}$) "is one of the strongest antipsoric medicines, as its annexed "peculiar effect on the healthy body," (895 symptoms of its drug-disease) "manifests, but cannot be given without injury to sick "persons suffering from itch, in more than one or two small sugar "pellets moistened with a fluid impregnated with its decillionth "developed power. But individuals injured by allopathic stimu-"lants, and those who are very much debilitated and very sensible, "will not bear even this small dose, and if this drug is then "called for from homœopathic reasons, they can only be permitted "to *smell* once of a sugar-pellet of the size of a hempseed, moist-"ened with that solution, as a dose sufficient to perpetuate its "effect from fifteen to twenty days."

Now we candidly ask all unprejudiced men of common sense; professional or unprofessional, if they have ever read more nonsense than is contained in these few quotations? It is difficult to believe that this has been printed a thousand times, in a country distinguished for its high standing in literature, for its great philosophers and learned men; and this in the midst of the nineteenth century! On attentive reflection, it is still more difficult to believe that men exist, who, professing to possess sound judgment and to be well educated, and pretending that the life and health of their

fellow-men could be confidently entrusted to their professional skill and care, would credit only for a moment such hare-brained absurdities as purest truth and greatest wisdom, nay! boldly assert, that by such productions, "a new era has dawned upon all the "natural sciences; a new period has dawned upon pathology, "as well as on all the certain sciences, and that its author is to be "regarded as one of the greatest medical geniusses of the age." (See Hering's Concise View, page 4 and 24.)

The greatest truth ever written by Samuel Hahnemann is his own conclusion, which he artlessly draws from his statements in regard to the *miracles*, the *glorified state*, and the *new world* developed by his manipulations from his drug-atoms.—He calls the monstrous children of his morbid fancy or eccentric charlatanism by their right names! Indeed, if to believe implicitly in the developed power contained in a sugar-pellet not larger than a hempseed, and moistened with *the decillionth dilution of common table salt*, that is, with the

$$\frac{1}{1000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000000}\text{th}$$

part of one grain, and even that this power is communicated to the surrounding atmosphere so as to be imparted to the human body *by smelling*, if that, we say, does not imply supernatural powers, then all our conceptions of this and similar expressions are wrong and have no meaning. The conceits of Eudæmons and Kakodæmons of the oldest mythologists; the theurgy and demonology of the most superstitious heathens; the most fanciful religious notions of many East Indians, their Dews, Amshadpans, Izeds, Fervers, &c.; what are all these compared with Hahnemann's virtues developed from one grain of a simple drug, "developed by art and not by reason of "the original matter," (Concise View, page 14.) developed *ad infinitum* at *his* pleasure with *different degrees* of power from *all* natural substances, by *his* homœopathic *manipulations!*—powers acting not only with volition, but with the *most judicious* medical reflection, since they either suspend their action, when it appears to them better to do so; for instance, always after their work is finished in healthy persons, or operate in diseased individuals *for weeks*, and *never injure* if they do no benefit, though all their operations are always *absolute* and *unconditional*, and therefore also *omnipotent* within the limits of human life, "so that if their "dose *was large enough*, each living human organism must *at*

"*any time and all events* become affected or even *infected* by the "drug-disease."*

* See Organon, 4th edition, §27 and Materia Medica, Vol. II., page 20. It is worth remarking, that here Hahnemann says, "if the dose was *large enough*;" but that in his Chronic Diseases, Vol. I. p. 209, and in other places, he says, that his followers may give *still smaller doses* than he advises, since it is impossible to select too small a dose.—It may be conjectured with some probability, that Hahnemann's doctrine of developed virtues originated with him in the belief of a kind of *demonology*, since on an attentive perusal of all his works we shall find some distinct indications of it, (see Organon, 4th edition, note to §203 mentioned above, where he appears to believe in witchcraft.) Nearly the same conceits and expressions used by him, occur in the explanations of old authors about such superstitions. Macrobius in his Saturnalia, lib. 1. cap. 23. quotes from the works of Posidonius of Apamea, (a stoic philosopher and astrologer, who as is said was the teacher of Cicero,) entitled "περι μρωων και δαιμονων" the following etymological explanation of the term demonology, "quia ex ætherea substantia parta, atque *divisa* qualitas illis est." Morus in mysteriis pietatis, p. 118, thinks that the Greek name of *Dæmon* arises from "δαιειν" that is, "*to divide*,"—the homœopathic *divisions* in optima forma. Should the future confirm what some believe, viz. that Hahnemann has acted honestly, at least in regard to his publications about homœopathia and his itch-doctrine, and has published only what he himself really believed to be true, we may account for his singular propensity to mysticism, magic, demonology, &c., by his hereditary family-disposition, if we are not mistaken in presuming that he is a descendant from Joh. Ludovicus Hannemann, a famous theologist and physician of the 17th century, and professor of natural philosophy at the Danish University of Kiel, in Holsatia. He was the author of many singular works on Alchemy, and on similar mystical topics, regarding the discovery of the philosopher's stone for longevity, &c., among others of Aurora oriens; Xystus in hortum hesperidum; Tubalkain stantem ad fornacem; De analogo Urim et Thumim in mente humana; Circulum philosophiæ adeptæ cum Theologia, et comparationem mysteriorum Theologiæ cum lapidis philosophorum, arcano magisterio; De aureis pomis in vase argentes; Methodus nova et accurata cognoscendi *simplicia vegetabilia*; the latter contains a new and accurate method of recognising *simple plants*, and appears to be similar to our Samuel Hahnemann's first latin work on homœopathia, "de Viribus medicamentorum positivis." As we have not Joh. Ludov. Hannemann's work last mentioned, but have only collected these literary notices from Joecher's Gelehrten Lexicon, 1750, we leave it for others possessing this literary curiosity to investigate the correctness of our presumption, and also to ascertain whether or not, the same Joh. Ludv. Hannemann disputes with us the priority of our important proposal about the cheap homœopathical whitewashing of negros as mentioned above, by his treatises entitled "Dealbatio Æthiopis et Scrutinium nigredinis posterorum Cham sive Æthiopum." These researches would be highly important, not only in regard to the literary pedigree of "one of the greatest medical geniusses of our age," but also in a psychological respect.—Fortes creantur fortibus et bonis, &c.

To the difference in spelling both names none can object, who knows that this was not unusual in old times; thus for instance the original name of the great reformer, Melanchton, was a Greek translation from the German, Schwarzerd, (Blackearth) and that of his kinsman and his noble and gallant companion in the combat for truth, Johann Reuchlin, was Capnio, (Smokeman.) At an age when only few were well educated, and few only knew how to write, it was very easy for the *n* to be accidentally changed into an *h*, and much more so, as in upper Saxony the short syllables are generally pronounced long. This change may also have been the consequence of the death of Joh. Lud. Hannemann's son, who had been killed in a duel in the year 1679, after he likewise had published some mystical works, for instance, De aulicorum et Martis filiorum arcanis; De medicorum divinitate; both quite in the style of our Samuel's medical omnipotence and his predilection for arcana; it may be that after this fatal event the family migrated from Holsatia to Upper Saxony, the native country of Hahnemann, as we also find in Adelung's supplement to Joecher's work, above mentioned, a poet born in Leipzig, who had changed his family name Hannemann into Alectorander or Cockman, the Greek translation of the German Hahnemann.—It is also very singular, that exactly a hundred years before Samuel Hahnemann published the first outlines of his doctrine, (1795) a Hannemann wrote a treatise "*on the inheritance of lunacy*," (see Misc. Acad. Nat. cur. Dec. 3, An. 3, 1695.) This treatise is

Any further discussion would be unnecessary and useless for those who implicitly believe in homœopathia or Hahnemannism, even at the risk of being guilty of the grossest credulity and superstition, by trusting in such infinitely developed powers or miracles. Their dimmed reason will always dwell on *facts*, which apparently confirm every chimera offered to their defective judgment and to their perverse imagination; utterly unmindful whether these accord with the first fundamental laws of the human understanding and with the acknowledged laws of nature or not, they will shun all closer investigation of which they are incapable, and will even attribute facts, which are opposed to their narrow conceits and superstitious credulity, rather to mistakes and to the ignorance of their opposers, to some unknown and unavoidable counteracting accidents, or to the only old truth, which even homœopathists modestly admit, that death is beyond the reach of all human power. "Ad quamcunque "disciplinam velut tempestate delati, ad eam, tamque ad saxum "adhærescunt."—*Cicero.*

But there are undoubtedly among the adherents of Hahnemannism many who are zealously anxious for truth, and, conscious of all the requisites of their arduous vocation, are willing to acquire them wherever they can be attained; knowing that many phenomena in nature, and especially in the life of organized bodies, cannot be explained by, or referred to, universal laws on account of our limited means; and dissatisfied with the frequent changes of the so called systems of practical medicine, with the many contradictory statements in objects of daily occurrence, by physicians equally engaged in extensive practice in one and the same country, and even city &c., they believe themselves entitled or even forced to adopt the statements of homœopathia as facts, under the impression that the theoretical explanation of these facts, which are confirmed by tests, trustworthy in their eyes, might belong to those of similar extraordinary phenomena in organized life, which are likewise not accordant to, or explainable by, the present state of natural philosophy and physiology, and that homœopathia is at least not more unsafe than all other modes of medical practice.

considered very able and interesting, especially if we consider that, at that time, such subjects were but little noticed; probably he was conscious of his hereditary disposition and had merely described his own state during its lucid intervals; so, too, we possess in the modern literature of Germany an interesting treatise on intoxication, written by a distinguished philosopher and author, who was very intemperate. Be this as it may, we are gratified in having thus perhaps contributed some valuable materials for the minute biography of so distinguished a man, of which he himself hitherto may have been entirely ignorant.

There are many suggestions in Hahnemann's works and in treatises published in his defence, which dazzle the eyes of many, who are easily prepossessed by superficial and sophistical reasoning and by the novelty of the homœopathic doctrine, not aware, from their want of a close scrutiny, of its proper meaning, nor of the grossest superstition which it involves. We may justly hope that if such men become only more minutely acquainted with the extent and the tendency of the homœopathic doctrine, and if it be only clearly proved to them that Hahnemann did not use the expressions, "*miracles*," "*wonderful*," "*a glorified state*," "*a new creation*," metaphorically or hyperbolically, but that his doctrine admits no other explanations than those intimately connected with the said expressions, they would investigate these objects closely, and ashamed of their superstition, they would examine more minutely all the conditions indispensable for facts, whenever truth is to be established by them; thus prepared, they would agree with us, either that the substance of this doctrine must be rejected and abandoned, or that life and health will be exposed more than ever to the worst consequences of the rudest medical empiricism, resulting in addition from an implicit belief in the action of supernatural powers, merely dependent upon the will of man, or on medical witchcraft. We feel therefore particularly bound to examine carefully the most prominent assertions of Hahnemann in regard to his third maxim of homœopathia; which is, that it is impossible to give too small a dose of any drug, provided that it is selected according to his maxim, similia similibus curantur, or to his itch-theory, and has been developed or potenzised by the proper manipulations.

As long as Hahnemann candidly confessed, that in referring only to the truth of his experiments, he was unable or unwilling to explain them by any acknowledged law of nature, we could only examine whether we can place confidence in his statements, as being instituted with due precaution against palpable mistakes, though they always would lead to a rude empiricism. But if, unable to depend positively on the acknowledged laws of nature, he refers only negatively to them, and asserts, that his maxim is founded on phenomena similar to others, which must be admitted, though they have hitherto remained unexplained, or have been supported only by untenable hypotheses: he then challenges his opposers to examine closely, whether this pretended negative similarity between his established hypothesis and those of the other natural pheno-

mena mentioned, be correct. Should it be found so, or should the operations of his virtues developed from drugs really belong to the same class with those phenomena, the true causes of which we must admit to be merely hypothetical, then we must farther examine, whether they cannot be explained consistently with human reason, or whether their belief involves implicit faith in supernatural powers, miracles, or witchcraft.

We know only two classes of natural powers—the vital powers of all living organized bodies, and the universal physical powers. The former we divide again into psychical or mental, and dynamical or those which refer to physical life; and the latter into mechanical and chemical powers. There are, therefore, four distinct manifestations of powers to be compared.

We leave out of the question all psychical or mental powers, implying, as the least of their characteristics, volition, either instinctive or intellectual; as we suppose that the candid homœpathists are willing unconditionally to reject all supernatural powers, miracles, spirits, etc. to which the adoption of any psychical power, developed by homœopathic manipulations, must unavoidably lead.

Dynamical powers are only the attributes of organized life, and cannot therefore be developed by man from substances destitute of organization and life, as earths, salts, metals, etc. from which Hahnemann pretends to develope immense virtues or powers.—The similarity with the vital powers of the human body would contradict, according to our numerous quotations from Hahnemann's works, his explicit opinion about them; since he repeatedly asserts, that his developed drug-virtues operate far more powerfully than the human vital powers do. According to his repeated assertions, that his developed drug-virtues always act absolutely and unconditionally, they are indeed omnipotent within the limits of life, and by far paramount to the human vital powers, which operate, in his opinion, "always in a miserable, automatical manner," and are capable only of extinguishing, in diseases, the remnants, always left to them by the surplus operations of his drug-virtues. No dynamical power operates absolutely and unconditionally, not even that which acts most independently, viz. progenitiveness in vegetable or in animal life. It must also not only appear extremely absurd, that a dynamical power developed from any substance should act in the *inverse ratio* of its weight,

but that *such* a power should become developed from flint, charcoal, sulphur, etc. by such processes as evidently belong to the most effectual ones of *destroying* all dynamical power, even in all bodies endowed with life. Common sense must consider trituration and solution as the best modes of destroying life, where it exists, rather than of procreating it. The homœopathic drug-virtues cannot therefore be compared with the *dynamical* powers of organized living bodies.

Neither Hahnemann nor his followers would admit the adoption of any *mechanical* power, though he has explained the direct and indirect treatment in this manner, as we have seen above, where we have objected to his assertion, that in the indirect treatment the drugs must always operate obliquely. It would also be very singular to imagine, that the developed drug-virtues operate by the same mechanical laws as those by which a lever, a wedge, a plane, or any similar tool, acts. Moreover, such little planes, wedges, etc. many thousand billions of which are contained in a body not larger than a hemp-seed, must make the whole tour of the circulation, before they reach the proper place where the imprisoned itch is to be freed from its long confinement, or before they can smooth the purpura miliaris, the little wart on the right cheek, etc. And this singular conception would also admit that these marvellous deeds are to be performed by them, not merely as by *common* tools, but as if they acted at the same time as *circumspect and judicious* mechanics!—" Quæ molitio, quæ ferramenta, qui " vectes, quæ machina, qui ministri tanti operis fuerunt?"—*Cicero.**

The profession has hitherto known of only three instances in which drugs, when given internally, are known to act by their

* The supposition that the virtues developed from drugs act mechanically, offers a favourable opportunity for demonstrating, by an amusing arithmetical calculation, the huge extent of the nonsense to which homœopathia leads. It is interesting in so far as we become, by it, more minutely acquainted with the admirable niceties of homœopathic doses, and particularly with the proportion really existing between an atom of their higher dilutions and the scarcely imaginable smallest magnitude of other bodies. Thus it is easy to prove, that the ratio between a drug-atom, contained in the thirtieth dilution---which is, according to the latest precepts of Hahnemann, the best to be used, if, as he explicitly recommends, his followers should not be willing to resort rather to still higher ones---and a mote or a particle of the finest dust perceptible in a sunbeam, is far greater than the ratio between the latter and the mass of our *whole globe*; and that therefore, all circumstances being equal, this globe could be *moved by a mote more easily*, than the mote itself by a homœopathic atom of the thirtieth dilution, or "potenz."

We have only to take into account, that a cubic inch of atmospheric air weighs half

mechanical operation; metallic mercury, given by many ounces, in ileus or iliac-passion, when arising from intus-susception of the intestines; tin-filings, in cases of tape-worm; and Dolichos pruriens, (Stizolobium, Pers.) recommended in cases of lumbrici and ascarides, and recently even in cases of Asiatic cholera: but their number would be as immense as that of natural substances, if homœopathists admit the mechanical operation of their developed drug-virtues. Thus the mechanical mode of the action of the homœopathic drug-virtues is likewise put out of the question.

All the hopes of homœopathists of assigning to their eudæmons and spirits an honourable place among the powers of nature, hitherto known, rest therefore on the *chemical* powers. But in this also they must feel quite disappointed; because all experience teaches, that the chemical properties of any substance are *never* changed by *any mechanical division*, or by *any dilution* with, or

a grain, and be permitted to adopt that a sphere of one inch diameter, formed of motes, is at least twice as heavy, or weighs one grain; partly because the motes are proved to possess a considerably greater gravity than the atmospheric air; partly also because the proposition requires the weight of one grain for a cubic sphere, and the whole calculation becomes more simplified by it. Farther, knowing, by optical experiments, that the smallest body visible, without artificial aid, cannot be less than the one thousandth part of one inch, the diameter of a sphere of visible motes can therefore not contain more than a thousand of them. The whole sphere of motes weighing one grain, and containing one thousand in diameter, will form a sphere which contains 523,500,000 motes. Let us increase this number with 476,500,000, under the impression that the motes are still lighter and nearer to the weight of atmospheric air, and also for the convenience of using the power of ten; the sphere of motes will then contain 1,000,000,000, or 10^{1}: the weight of one mote will of course be accordingly $\frac{1}{10^{9}}$. The whole weight of our globe is nearly equal to one with 25 zeros in pounds, or to one with 29 zeros in grains; the thirtieth homœopathic dilution is equal to a fraction of one divided by one with sixty zeros, or to $\frac{1}{10^{60}}$ These numbers give the following geometrical proportion, wherein the first member is equal to the homœopathic dilution; the second, or the two middle members to the weight of one mote, and the third is the resulting number, viz. $\frac{1}{10^{60}} : \frac{1}{10^{9}} = \frac{1}{10^{9}} : 10^{42}$ or one mote, weighing $\frac{1}{10^{9}}$ of a grain, and the thirtieth dilution weighing $\frac{1}{10^{60}}$, would require as the third number of the proposition, ten elevated to the forty-second power: but the proportion between the weight of our globe, expressed by grains, compared with the weight of a mote, gives the following proportion: $10^{29} : \frac{1}{10^{9}} = \frac{1}{10^{9}} : \frac{1}{10^{47}}$; or $\frac{1}{10^{47}}$ is the third member of this proportion. This compared with $\frac{1}{10^{60}}$ as the same third member in the former proportion, gives a number too small in its denominator by 10^{13} or by one with 13 zeros: just ten billions, which our globe would weigh more in grains, (about one thousand millions in pounds) to be then in the same proportion to one mote, as this is to one homœopathic atom of the thirtieth dilurion.—q. e. d.

any solution in, a fluid not decomposing the substance. The oxydation of mercury, or of some other metals, by a long trituration, and other changes produced in substances where caloric is simultaneously developed, depend on other causes than on mechanical division alone, and can have no influence in this case. It has long been known that gold, which, unlike most other metals, is not oxydated by hammering, or by other means which considerably diminish its cohesion, when contemporaneously exposed to the atmospheric air, may be reduced by mechanical power to one millionth part of a geometrical line in thickness, and still it retains all its characteristic properties so fully, that we have reason to think it might be made much thinner, without losing them in the least. The homœopathic maxim, "similia similibus curantur," is further opposed to all chemical processes; since these are based upon the laws of affinity, resulting from *diversity:* and wherever a chemical process operates, two or more *contraria*, but *not similia*, act upon one another; and their chemical action upon each other *augments* with their increasing diversity. The opposite maxim, "contraria contrariis curantur," though likewise opposed to rational medicine, would therefore accord much better than the homœopathic maxim with the chemical laws of nature, which preside over many, if not all vital actions, however essentially changed and modified they are by the latter.—The homœopathic triturations are particularly contrary to the old and still acknowledged law established in chemistry, viz. corpora non agunt nisi fluida; that is, when two or more substances shall act chemically upon one another, *one* at least must be liquid, or must contain a fluid, in being crystalized, or a hydrate.

On glancing at Hahnemann's explanation of his developed drug-virtues, it is evident that *he rejects* their chemical operations: for had he only asserted that the neutralizing chemical processes do not go on so unaltered in the living animal body as they do in substances in the crucible, it would have been consistent with sound physiology, which does not acknowledge that the universal chemical laws act, in the living body, precisely in the same manner as in physical nature. But a principal objection to this part of the subject is his assertion, that the chemical properties of his developed drug-virtues are changed before the drugs are taken. Thus he asserts, that earths, metals, sulphur, etc. etc. become *soluble* in alcohol, by homœopathic manipulations; and

that substances *not volatile*, as table-salt, silicia, etc. become *so volatile*, or *easily evaporable*, that by merely *smelling* of them once, the diseased state is cured, or changed at least for many weeks, in spite of *all* external influences of the atmosphere, of food, drink, mental impressions, etc. On the other hand, he considers his duly potenzised drugs to be so far from volatile, however much they are so in the eyes of all chemists, that, in his opinion, his sugar-pellets, moistened with highly potenzised drugs, may be *preserved for years*, without losing their properties. Thus he says that Phosphorus, after being homœopathically potenzised, remains, without the least precaution, unchanged for years; though every one acquainted only with the elements of chemistry, even of former ages, when this science was not yet so over-refined as it is in his eyes at present, knows, that Phosphorus is extremely volatile, and is protected with great difficulty from evaporating and oxydating, and that nothing promotes both more easily than trituration. Farther he states, that Baryta acquires the property of being unchanged by acids, (Chr. Dis. vol. ii. p. 33), and that the symptoms observed after the use of pure lime are the same as those caused by acetate of lime, (ibid, p. 63). Acetic acid, which has so great a chemical influence on almost all substances, especially on most earths, metals, etc. loses, in his opinion, its prominent influences upon such substances, after their virtues are homœopathically developed, even when not taken as medicines: so that this acid is used by him and his followers as an innocent or unmedicinal fluid, and as a mere menstruum.* This likewise contradicts all experience, which teaches that acetic acid, particularly in its concentrated state, even when externally applied, quickly destroys parts of the living animal body; and if taken internally, acts as a violent poison: though, when sufficiently diluted, it becomes

* As usual with Hahnemann, we find this assertion likewise contradicted by himself, in his Mater. Med. vol. i. p. 14. where he says, that the poisonous effects of Belladonna are much *increased* by the addition of acetic acid. This evidently proves, that, considering Belladonna in itself a powerful drug, he must value acetic acid also, as a *very effectual*, and not as an indifferent one. Vinegar, and similar vegetable acids, were always considered, by the physicians of all schools, as the best antidotes against all kinds of narcotic plants, and especially against Belladonna: of course Hahnemann must assert the contrary, even without any regard to his committing the grossest inconsistency. There is hardly to be found an author more careless in regard to contradictions and inconsistencies, even to those which are quite unnecessary and easily avoidable. But he knows best what he can offer to his infatuated disciples and admirers, without losing their implicit confidence and humble respect; and for others he never was able nor intended to write as a dignified medical author, since he commenced the career of a quack.

vinegar, which injures only dyspeptic, hysteric persons, etc. In addition to all these facts, his developed drug-virtues are directly opposed to the known laws of chemistry, which do not admit an inverse ratio between the weight and power of a substance, but prove the contrary, especially according to the acute researches of Berthollet, in his Statique Chimique, which are found, at least in that respect, correct.

We have now to compare the action of Hahnemann's developed drug-virtues with the operation of those agents, termed *imponderabilia*, which appear to be particularly attractive to him and his followers.—A man who searches for "great truths," by which he thinks to benefit mankind so much, might be excused for his gross ignorance of the modern discoveries in natural philosophy and chemistry, and for not being aware, that the so termed imponderabilia are now considered as the *most powerful* chemical agents which preside over all chemical processes, and that the greatest chemists of the present century have founded the whole system of chemistry upon the reciprocal electro-chemical relations of substances considered as elementary; thus the great chemist Berzelius has constructed his chemical theory and classification upon the electro-chemical phenomena attending the mutual affinity of bodies, as bases and acids. Hahnemann, however, is so far behind, and so ignorant of the progress of chemistry, as not even to know the difference between muriatic and chloric acid; (see Mat. Med. Vol. V. second edition, 1826, p. 98,) but, nevertheless, this brazen-faced charlatan, though a contemporary of Wentzel, Lavoisier, Scheele, Humphrey Davy, J. B. Richter, &c., ventures to assume a high standing as a chemist, and to ridicule and despise modern chemistry, as he does all ancient and modern medicine!—Admitting that his drug-virtues must be considered as similar to the other imponderable agents, can he or any one else demonstrate *by facts* that caloric, light, electricity, magnetism, physical as well as animal, operate in an *inverse ratio* to their presumed weight and bulk, as his developed drug-virtues must do if they existed any where else but in his own morbid fancy? Do not all phenomena prove *just the contrary?* Should light operate in the inverse ratio of its quantity, all animals would see better in direct proportion to the darkness; plants would best flourish in places precluded from the access of light, and fade away when exposed to the bright sun-shine, &c. Should caloric operate in the inverse ratio of its quantity, a substance might be ignited by a plain glass, or still better, by being

placed behind a concave one; we should feel warmest in the extreme cold of winter, and coldest in the heat of summer, &c. Electricity depends also on the direct ratio of its developed quantity, otherwise a smaller surface of glass or rosin would be better adapted to develope a large quantity of both electricities than a larger one; none of the many experiments with the electrometer, the electrical condenser, the Leyden vial, the electrophor, &c., could be satisfactorily explained. The same may be said of galvanism if it is to be considered as different from electricity; the degree of its extensive or intensive powers depending, either on the *largeness* of the surface, or on the *number* of the plates. In regard to magnetism, a *smaller* piece of the same magnet would also prove more powerful than a *larger* one, or at least from the smallest magnet the strength and extent of power could be developed ad infinitum; Schweigger's multiplicator, Faraday's late interesting experiments in confirmation of Oerstedt's great discovery in producing electricity by magnetism, and many other experiments, which have advanced natural history and chemistry during the present age more than many centuries did before, could not be explained, if electricity, galvanism and magnetism should be presumed to act, similar to the homœopathically developed drug-virtue, in the inverse ratio of weight and power. We suppose, that even animal magnetism, though yet little known, appears to depend in a direct ratio upon bulk, for, if this were not the case, a person unpleasantly affected by the approach of a cat, would either feel so at any distance, or would have lost all sensitiveness of this kind in infancy, by unavoidable and continual habit. It would also be difficult to explain why generally, strong, stout and healthy persons best impart animal magnetism, and why sometimes they feel so exhausted by it, that instances are recorded, where healthy and vigorous magnetiseurs, have died suddenly, immediately after such an over-exertion; though we do not believe that animal magnetism will revive a person who has been for a long time asphyctic, as Hahnemann asserts in his Organon, 4th ed. on § 291.—In a manner, never before observed by any one, Hahnemann also minutely distinguishes, in the second volume of his Mat. Med., the different symptoms elicited in healthy persons by the north and south-pole of a magnet, and refers with peculiar emphasis and extraordinary sarcasm to the action of magnetism generally. As if this agent was properly known by him only, he asks, on p. 213, among other bombast, to edify his

school of ignoramuses, " Is not the centillionth part of a grain, (a " fraction with 600 zeros as denominator), still infinitely too heavy " for the imponderable part, for this kind of *spirit*, which has flown " from the magnetic stick into the living body? and will you feel " so much struck with amazement, at the homœopathic doses of " an efficient drug, amounting to one sixtillionth, one octillionth, " or one decillionth part of a grain, which are so immensely large, " when compared with the invisible magnetic power?"—In a similar manner he says, on p. 293 of his Organon, (4th ed.) referring to all the stupid allopathists, " Let mathematicians explain to " them how true it is, that if a substance be divided into any num- " ber of parts, its smallest particle will always contain something " of this substance, and therefore it can never become a nonentity; " let them be told by natural philosophers, if they are susceptible " of instruction, that there are numerous powerful things (called " potenzes), which are totally without weight, as caloric, light, &c. " and are, therefore, always infinitely lighter than the contents of " a drug in its homœopathic dose; let them estimate, if they can, " the weight of an angry word, by which a bilious fever is gene- " rated, or the weight of sad tidings from an only son, by which " his mother is killed."

Those who, from extravagant imagination, narrow reason or credulous infatuation, cannot reflect with calmness, are exceedingly dazzled by this and similar explanations of Hahnemann, and instead of minutely analyzing such common-place instances and flat reasonings as they easily could, they become still more fascinated by the acuteness and depth of intellect, as well as by the immense wisdom and experience of their " great genius."

Hahnemann generally uses a singular kind of paralogism or a false and deceitful conclusion, when he endeavours to appeal from his pretended facts to common sense. With but little attention every one will observe his mode of ratiocination to consist in this, that, because we cannot explain a certain phenomenon, therefore not only his statements of a phenomenon, which is either distantly or not at all similar to the former, must not only be credited, but his explanation of it must likewise be true, be it ever so whimsical and foolish. In the case before us his singular course of reasoning is this: because we cannot exactly explain in what manner the magnet acts on the living organized body, therefore we must not only believe the salutary effect of his developed drug-virtues, but also that the manner and cause of their operation are similar

or identical with those of the magnet,—that is, similar to a manner which neither he himself nor any other mortal being knows. Another mode in which he argues, is no less delusive and false, in being contrary to the true old maxim, " a posse ad esse non valet " consequentia," or " because a thing *can exist*, it *does not* follow " that it *must exist*." More clearly explained, his ratiocination consists in this, that because the *mere intellectual* or *subjective* condition of the truth of an assertion, or of a deceitful experiment, might well answer *negatively* for its real existence, or because a phenomenon might be imagined to depend on a cause, the adoption of which is *not opposed* to the logical laws of the human understanding (possibilitas logica): therefore also the phenomenon itself, and its dependence upon the imaginary and adopted cause, must also be *positively* true, may it be ever so much contradicted either *directly* by daily experience, or *indirectly* by an abstract of other facts, and may it therefore want all the conditions on which the *objective* possibility rests, (possibilitas phænomenon sive realis.) Thus, for instance, because it is not absolutely contrary to the logical laws of our understanding to believe in mermaids, or centaurs, it would follow, according to such reasoning, that we cannot doubt the existence of such beings, whenever something happens which may be easily explained by them; or in a nearer relation to the object before us: because, it is not contrary to the logical laws of the human understanding, to believe in spirits which might preside as independent or delegated beings over all the phenomena of matter, wherever this is considered as united with an imponderabile or with any thing else, therefore Hahnemann thinks himself fully justified in regarding his developed drug-virtues also not only as imponderabilia, but also as transmuted by his manipulations into spirits.

F. Bacon says very correctly, " Experiments touching trans- " mission of spirits and the force of imagination, work most upon " weak minds and spirits; for instance, those of sick, superstitious " and fearful persons, children and young creatures." After the simplicity of the earliest ages had passed, when the mere dictates of sages or impostors could make persons believe every thing they imagined or hoped for, base impostors, or blind ignorant fanatics pursued this course, and by pretended facts substituted credulity and superstition for the true explanations of natural phenomena. By such means, demonology, magic, alchemy, witchcraft and similar kinds of deception were palmed upon all classes of people

for many centuries, either by men, who deceived themselves from want of intelligent reflection or from ignorance; or by impostors, who valued their low interests higher than the prosperity of their fellow-men. In cases where the public was not disposed to believe them implicitly, they had always some facts at their command, by which they endeavoured to show the causal similarity or identity of those facts and their wonderful statements, knowing that the public cannot generally investigate minutely the true connexion between similar phenomena and their widely different *causes*, nor ascertain that the deception in regard to the identity of the causes of two or more *similar* phenomena, frequently arises merely from the *contemporaneous* action of the former.

Yet the old Greek and Roman philosophers thought that matter can never be reduced to nothing: Anaxagoras, for instance, acknowledged very distinctly the infinite divisibility of matter, by his ομοιμερειαι. Lucretius says in many places the same, e. g. on lib. i. v. 249,

> " Haud igitur redit ad Nihilum res ulla sed omnes,
> " Discidio redeunt in corpora materiai."

And F. Bacon says exactly the same in his Organon: " Nulla " violentia, nulla denique ætas aut diuturnitas temporis potest re- " digere aliquam vel minimam portionem materiæ in nihilum, " quin et sit aliquid et loci aliquid occupet." If every one must admit that any small quantity of a substance, soluble in water, alcohol, &c. or miscible with other substances by trituration in any large and disproportionate quantity, will *never* become *absolutely* nothing, but always remain *something*, especially if the substances in question do not operate chemically upon each other; does it follow therefrom that the effects of these substances on the human body, in any imaginable small quantity, must not only be perceptible, but still *greater* than when used in quantities many million times larger, because they have become transmuted into an imponderabile, different from any other one hitherto known, and therefore also from other fancied homœopathic imponderabilia, developed in a similar manner from other simple drugs? The infinite divisibility of matter is so intimately connected with our abstract ideas, that without its adoption, our conceptions in regard to the existence of bodies of all shapes and sizes appear to be vague, and would force us to admit the still more unmeaning conception of a vacuum, though the atomistical theory of modern chemistry

explains with much acuteness the existence of primitive atoms. Admitting, therefore, with Hahnemann, that the smallest imaginable fraction of a substance must always be something of it, his other assertion involves itself the grossest petitio principii, and gives rise to the simple question, why this, his proposition, should not be directly applicable to the smallest particle itself, without any further developement; or by what reason or experiment can he prove that the matter, which he himself declares indestructible, becomes nevertheless, by its developement, extinct as matter, and is transmuted into a spirit, a thought, &c., in short, into something which is not matter? Hahnemann's adoption of spirits, into which all matter becomes changed, palpably contradicts not only his assertion about the continuance of matter, but the latter offers the most conclusive argument against the adoption of the former. Should his virtues developed from drugs be, as he pretends, identical with the substances or agents hitherto known and called imponderabilia, then he must either admit that the principal characteristic of matter, viz. absolute ponderability, has ceased to be its essential attribute, or that the same thing can be material and immaterial; and also it would appear unnecessary to recommend the tiresome development of these imponderabilia from the different drugs; as they are made ready at hand for us, and are unquestionably more free from all matter than if formed by repeated triturations, dilutions, and shaking of drugs, &c.—Since Professor Oerstedt's discovery of the identity of electricity and magnetism, we know of only three agents called imponderabilia, viz. light, caloric and electricity. We should, therefore, have only to select from these three, one, or, (if we wished to use, contrary to Hahnemann's prescriptions, more than one at a time), two or three for the experiments on healthy and the cure of diseased persons, without resorting to one of the same imponderabilia, developed by a troublesome process from other substances. Could any sound conclusion be drawn from Hahnemann's contradictory assertions, we could believe his meaning to be, that his developed drug-virtues act similarly to one of the known imponderabilia, since he considers, (at the end of his Organon, and in his Mat. Med. Vol. II.) physical as well as animal magnetism, as specific remedies, and highly recommends them as adjuvants to his other drugs if they fail to operate, notwithstanding their almost unconditional action. If Hahnemann does not consider his developed drug-virtues as operating

precisely like one of the known imponderabilia, but as different specific ones, *similar* only, but in regard to their imponderability, *not identical*, then he has not merely enriched the medical profession with many millions of new salutary powers, but also natural philosophy with as many imponderabilia as there are substances, because, as we have seen, drug-virtues may be developed *from all* natural substances.—Indeed! it is strange that no philosopher, in fact, that no man, except Hahnemann, has hitherto discovered any one of this immense number of imponderabilia. As every great agent of that kind has only an influence on the living body, in so far as it corresponds more or less to its general operation in nature, it would be very singular if the homœopathic imponderabilia alone, should act exclusively on the human body, and did not manifest their existence by some other natural phenomena. The considerations, that the knowledge of the laws of nature is now much advanced, the principles of natural science simplified, since agents hitherto regarded as different, are now proved to be identical; farther, that Hahnemann manufactures at once millions of imponderable agents, which he is unable to explain, except but by a comparatively few, most uncertain and delusive experiments on healthy and diseased persons, which are also observed only by him and his adherents,—we say these considerations alone should shake all confidence in his doctrine in the eyes of every impartial judge.

If, as we might suppose from the paragraph quoted above, Hahnemann distinctly considers his potenzised drug as similar to a kind of idea, a thought, or a passion; then we see no propriety in prescribing for patients, either imponderabilia homœopathically developed from drugs, or those evolved by an electrical machine, a magnet, &c. since then a psychical treatment only would be sufficient; thus in a bilious fever we could best succeed by prescribing a homœopathic dose of anger; in dropsy, apoplexy, especially if arising from want of food or from other great distress, we could recommend only a homœopathic dose of sorrow and affliction; in erotomania, a homœopathic dose of love; and the itch, this very pandæmon of all chronic diseases, would likewise be best cured by some of those passions, which must be considered as the best antipsorics, for the reasons above mentioned.

Those who become acquainted with homœopathia and Hahnemannism by some of its votaries, are quite inadvertent to the

magnitude of numbers, with which this doctrine abounds, and are so much startled by its vague conceptions, that, considering the immense divisibility of matter, and the influence of the finest particles of many substances upon our senses, they become satisfied by a summary decision in regard to the similar action of agents called imponderabilia, and also to those phenomena which depend on the great divisibility of matter itself.

We are far from referring all phenomena in universal nature, and much less in organized living bodies, to the action of palpable matter. We are also quite ignorant wherein any power really exists, and know only how to distinguish generally in the living body, that which excites its reaction, from the reaction itself. All vital reaction is termed dynamical, in order to distinguish it from the physical and chemical powers, though they always appear, if not to depend upon, at least to be connected with, and modified by matter, which must be considered as their common bearer, since all the physical and chemical powers of nature reside in matter.

This intimate connexion between power and matter frustrated the deepest and acutest metaphysical researches of the greatest philosophers, and will never be satisfactorily explained by any mortal being, because all matter appears to our external senses as finite, while infinity is the ideal abstract of power, and we cannot imagine that any power can cease to act otherwise than by another counteracting one, where of course the seeming passivity consists likewise in a counteraction. Matter and power, or the *substance* and the *accident* of metaphysicians, appear therefore to us widely different, and in our finite existence we are more able *indistinctly* to *imagine*, than *clearly to conceive*, how one can result from, or be combined with the other. Our notion of the infinite is, when properly analyzed, only negative, or opposite to finite; and we should think, that if we could ever acquire an exact positive and minute insight into the infinite, the impenetrable mystery with which Providence has veiled from us the existence of all things and of ourselves would disappear.* It may be therefore only par-

* The fact that man can imagine and still more comprehend, at least indirectly, what infinity is, and can use formulæ of infinite magnitudes for minute and correct calculations, may prove that the human mind or whatever name we might give to the cause of the human understanding, belongs to another world, since it appears inconsistent to think, that an infinite property can depend upon a finite substance. We cannot pursue any farther these researches, which embrace the most subtile antitheses of the human mind; but in opposition to Hahnemann's frantic opinion about the infinite power in his drugs and the limited powers of the vital functions, the principle of life itself appears to the philosopher infinite in all organized bodies; and to

donable in men like Hahnemann and his followers, to use the expressions of infinite in a positive sense, when they wish to explain the great divisibility of matter. If for instance, one grain of musk fills a large hall, so as to be recognized by our sense of smell in every point of that hall, without losing any perceptible part of its weight after months or years; what else does this prove, than the great divisibility of this substance, and that the sphere of perception of our olfactory nerves is greater than that of our optic and other nerves? Does it follow therefrom, that the matter of musk becomes transmuted into an infinite spirit, or must be considered as a more powerful drug than a hundred others not so spontaneously divisible and volatile, much more than opium, arsenic, &c. Does it follow therefrom, that wherever musk is applicable as a remedy, we must abstain from giving it in the usual allopathic dose of from two to twenty grains, but that it would be sufficient to let the patient enter every four or six weeks a large hall, and breathe for a moment its atmosphere, pregnant with the self-developed virtue of one grain? Perhaps homœopathists will consider this useless, because miserable nature only, and not their duly consecrated hands have developed the infinite virtue of musk!* The thick fibres of

preside in the same manner over the life of the largest whale as over the infusory insect; in a Laplace, Cuvier and Kant, as well as in the greatest idiot; the essence appears to be the same, but its manifestation in every individual depends upon the individual organization,—may this manifestation consist only in automatically observing external objects or in the self-consciousness of a higher origin and destination. To think any power developed by man from unorganized dead substances, equal or even paramount to the vital powers, is therefore the greatest madness which can be imagined.—"*Pour ne pas tomber dans une erreur grave, ne perdons pas de vue, que Dieu, être infini, se manifeste à nous être finis, par le fini. Dans cette manifestation, il est senti par chacun et par tous, aussi bien* un *que* multiple. *Dieu est tout, mais nous avons notre existence propre. Ce n'est qu'à la condition de tenir compte à la fois de* l'unite *et de la multiplicité, que nous pouvons concilier les interets généraux avec les interets particuliers, la morale publique avec la morale privée; c'est par là seulement que nous serons parfaitement réligieux.*"—(St. Simon.)

* Hahnemann in his Materia Medica (Vol. I. page 315) prescribes only the decillionth dilution of musk, and recommends it especially against hypochondria. It is difficult to combine this his advice with another remark on the same page, alluding to a very uncomfortable after-operation of musk, which would not well suit the people of "Egypt, the land of monsters;" and of all other countries where seraglios are kept. On account of this *very prejudicial* after-operation of musk, it might be advisable for authors on Materia Medica to expunge this article from the apparatus medicaminum, and for the druggists not to speculate in it; since, besides that one bag of musk will be sufficient for all Europe and America for centuries, the use of musk will be proscribed in all the oriental countries, as soon as the "great truth with all its blessings" is known there. We might suppose with propriety, that all the governments which have particular reason to promote the rapid increase of population, and especially the governments of North and South America, will soon prohibit the importation of such a destructive article.—In this manner we evidently see the true charcter of this "gigantic work," since the most tyrannical and the most republican governments are alike highly interested in attentively listening to and applying the

a small piece of meat are divisible into those which are so small as to be imperceptible by the best microscope; does it follow from this, that the decoction of such a microscopic fibre will afford the patient as much, or even more nourishment, after a homœopathic manipulation of this "natural substance," than a strong broth, made allopathically from some pounds of meat, because a nutritious imponderable virtue or spirit has been developed by the homœopathic division?

We are by no means justified in asserting the *absolute imponderability* of the so called imponderabilia. Light is curved and reflected by certain bodies under certain angles, and under other circumstances. Caloric distends bodies, if imparted to them in a larger quantity than their specific capacity for it can sustain. Electricity acts by its transition from one body to another, and by its distribution over the surface of bodies, in many respects like other ponderable fluids. These facts, among many others, prove therefore, that the imponderabilia, as they are termed, fill up a certain space, which they relinquish by force, that their motion from one place to another requires a certain time, and that they must therefore be considered at least as dependent on, or connected with matter, perhaps with more propriety as matter itself. Probably they are all ponderable, though by their nature, either the general laws of gravity are altered and modified by the bodies on which they act, particularly because their action is prominently a chemical one, (in which generally the laws of gravity, as all the other mechanical laws of nature, are more or less suspended;) or our scales are, and probably ever will be too imperfect to weigh them.*

"great truth."—The old philosopher, to whom the after-operation of musk as alluded to, might have become by the while indifferent,

"Nec tenet, omnia paullatim tabescere et ire
"Ad scopulum, spatio ætatis defessa vetusto."—*Lucr.*

will pardon us, when we think it a little overhasty to recommend it against hypochondria; since, however beneficial its first-operation may be for such unfortunate persons, we are exceedingly anxious concerning its after-operation, as we are taught by him and Dr. Hering, (on page 14, Concise View,) that "medicines do not become salutary "by their direct effects," &c.; "but they are salutary by reason of their after-opera-"tion." In this case homœopathists will have some particular difficulty to make both ends meet, viz: the salutary after-operation and the promotion of "domestic felicity," both so inseparable from all the other blessings of homœopathia (see Concise View, page 29.)

* The best scales ever made are those of the celebrated Fortin at Paris, being with a weight of four pounds, sensible to the fiftieth part of a grain, which is equal to $\frac{1}{1536000}$ of the weight, and those of Florenz at Vienna, with a weight of 4½ pounds, are sensible to $\frac{1}{4718592}$ of the same. According to our calculations made above, the absolute weight of a sphere containing many thousands of motes, would however not be determinable by these and much finer scales, and this sphere would seemingly appear to us imponderable, though nobody will deny that a mote, obeying the laws of

On closer reflection, every person of common sense will consider Hahnemann's expression, "let a substance be divided into any "number of parts, its smallest imaginable part will still contain "something of this substance, and can therefore never become a nonentity," as nothing else than what every one knows, viz. that a pound of a substance consists of so many ounces, drachms, grains, and as many smallest fractions of a grain, as we are pleased to imagine; or also that every power must be considered as a compound of as many small momenta, as we are willing to make by a division which can be likewise continued ad infinitum. We know by experience, that this expression and similar commonplace explanations of Hahnemann are considered by his followers as the greatest wisdom ever uttered by a philosopher, and that principally for these reasons, considered by them incontrovertible proofs of his doctrine, they cannot be made sensible of the absurdity, contained in his advice to prescribe only the smallest doses of homœopathic drugs. We see that this third maxim of homœopathia is yet in itself much more absurd than the two former; the greatest nonsense contained in it is, however, that the single part of

gravity by its falling to the ground in a calm, is a ponderable matter, and would weigh upwards of a thousand millionth part of one grain, if we were possessed of such delicate scales.—It would almost appear that Hahnemann has already invented much finer scales for his chiromantical experiments; it is however very singular and is a part of the high wisdom, only intelligible to homœopathists, that, as we have seen him value *exactly* the weight of the fluid which passes from the magnet, "at *one centillionth part of a grain*"—a trifle only equal to one divided by one with *six hundred* zeros,—he, with this minute knowledge of the *real weight* of the magnetic matter, nevertheless asserts it to be imponderable. We wish that Dr. Hering, or another intimate disciple of Hahnemann, would be pleased to solve also this great enigma, how anything can be weighed up to one centillionth part of one grain, and yet be imponderable? and to enrich the world with the construction of such marvelous scales, the great advantages of which are so obvious. The opinion, that a magnetic fluid passes from the magnet to the steel, and imparts the magnetic fluid to the latter, is erroneous; though often emphatically expressed by homœopathists in support of their doctrine. The two opposite magnetic powers or fluids are already slumbering in the steel, previous to its coming in any relation to the magnet, and this equilibrium of the two fluids being disturbed by the approach of one pole of a magnet to the smallest point of the steel, extends quickly to the whole mass of the latter in such a manner, that in its smallest sections, the homogeneous fluid is repelled and the heterogeneous fluid attracted, until by these mutual attractions and repulsions, both ends of the steel show respectively the north and the south poles; resembling in that respect the electricity of the largest conductor, in which from the beginning of the developement by the machine, plus electricity immediately collects at one end, and minus electricity at the other. This explanation of magnetism communicated to a piece of steel, is corroborated by the facts, that the steel which, when in connexion with the magnet, shows all the properties of the latter, loses again these peculiarities immediately on being disengaged from the magnet; farther, that the steel may be magnetized without the aid of a magnet, by being hammered, turned, exposed to the violet light of the sunbeams, by being heated red hot and suddenly cooled in cold water, in a perpendicular direction, &c. Magnetism is therefore in every respect not a suitable subject for homœopathists to explain the operations of their drug-virtues, and they, in reforming medicine, better insist upon their implicit belief in magic and witchcraft than to reform in this manner natural philosophy also.

a whole is greater than the whole itself, and that, notwithstanding, the infinite nature of the drug-virtues *begins* to become developed at the eighteenth dilution, and reaches its beneficial degree generally at the thirtieth; though according to his last suggestion, (see Chron. Diseases, Vol. I., page 209,) much higher dilutions should be used, as no dilution whatever can be considered too small; a direction which still more demonstrates that he thinks the smallest part of any thing is not merely something, but more than its larger part. It must also be difficult for any man of common sense to conceive, how an infinite being can ever arise from a finite one, and much less that an infinite being should be finite only on one side;—which would be the grossest contradictio in adjecto, provided this great philosopher would not assert, that his potenzised or developed drug-virtues are to be considered similar to the two branches of a parabole or the four branches of an hyperbole with their asymptotes—which, according to the doctrine of conic sections, are finite on one and infinite on the other side.

Even all these extravagant fancies admitted; what reason can Hahnemann assign for still continuing to recommend for some of his drugs, the third, sixth, &c. dilution, all of which are so many billion times inferior to the eighteenth, at which point he asserts all homœopathic virtues begin to be developed? The experiment has not yet been made to our knowledge, and Hahnemann wisely says nothing about it; but we would seriously ask him and his followers, whether, if all the remnants of the homœopathic dilutions of arsenic, sulphur, calcarea, &c., from the eighteenth up to the thirtieth degree of development should be collected, they verily believe, that these, together with the dilutions made previously to the eighteenth, would not contain the original grain? or if he himself, Dr. Hering, or any one of his faithful adherents, would confidently swallow the remnants of different homœopathic developments, for instance of arsenic, under the impression that the arsenic has become transmuted into an infinite spirit, an infinite being, an imponderable, &c., which "no longer possess those long "continued effects of a prejudicial character, which we have so "frequently to witness from the crude articles."—(See Dr. Hering's Concise View, page 14.) We believe that chemical analysis will certainly find in a sufficient quantity of such remnants, the substance from which the homœopathic virtue was developed; but then we may justly ask, by what kind of a new miracle these

virtues, spirits, *infinite beings*, imponderables, thoughts or passions, have been transmuted back again, and per synthesin into the substantial *finite* grains of arsenic, sulphur, &c.

It is indeed very ridiculous for Hahnemann to refer to the exactitude of mathematicians, as we have seen above. If he had ever possessed the slightest conception of the elements of this science, which he recommends to his followers as the best means for close thinking, he would have known the proper meaning of mathematical infinity in irrational numbers, in the series of converging fractions, &c.; he would have been aware, that in every problem into which such infinite magnitudes enter, or from which a ratio of the finite to the infinite part results, the mathematician can take so much of the latter as the minute exactness of the problem and its solution require, leaving the remaining infinite part unnoticed as nullity, or as a magnitude which has absolutely disappeared, in respect to the finite magnitude required for the object in view. Every well educated pupil of a good classic school, knows that the ratio of the diameter to the circumference of a circle, or that any even root of numbers not divisible by four, is irrational; but still the square contents of the surface of a circle or the cubic contents of a sphere, if ever so large or small, may be calculated with the greatest requisite exactness, though the infinite part of the ratio is neglected as a nullity. The astronomer loses relatively nothing by disregarding the infinite part of magnitudes, after he has used them according to the rules of the differential and integral calculus, by which he is even taught to consider them at least as disappearing; but he uses frequently the signs for the infinitely large and the infinitely small with the same facility as he uses all signs of finite magnitudes; his solution of a problem, generally embracing, what people not enlightened by homœopathia, formerly used to call *immense* magnitudes, proves so perfectly correct, that he can calculate the heavenly phenomena for centuries to come, as well as for the next hour. If mathematicians and astronomers had always thought it necessary to pursue another way, agreeable to Hahnemann's whimsical suggestions, that the most infinite part must always be minutely noticed; all ages which have past, and all those which are to come, would be insufficient to solve one problem; not one of the immense multitude of interesting and indispensable calculations could ever have been finished, and natural philosophy, astronomy, &c., would have remained, and still remain in

their infancy. No astronomer has, to our knowledge, as yet been obliged minutely to consider a ratio between one and the 120th power of ten, used by Hahnemann in his 60th developed power of the Thuya occidentalis, or the tree of life. (See Materia Medica, Vol. V., page 123.)—Indeed, if a Hahnemann can claim with propriety, much greater exactitude for his infallible method of curing all diseases than mathematicians and even astronomers aim at; then his remarkable declaration, "every one must admit that the healing art has not existed before me" (preface, 4th edition of the Organon,) is likewise correct.

From the immense quantity of hare-brained nonsense which distinguishes this "new art of healing," much of which our limits oblige us to omit, we must notice the following assertion contained in Hahnemann's works, (see his Treatise on Chronic Diseases, Organon, &c.,) and also in Dr. Hering's Concise View. The latter says, in accordance with Hahnemann's assertion, on page 20, "The preparations ought not therefore to be transmitted "from place to place in a fluid state, because their energy is liable "to be excessively increased by the long continued, though moderate "agitation, which they thus undergo."

A man who asserted, that mere *mechanical* division can develope from *all* natural substances, a power bordering *on miracles*, could not complete his vast nonsense better, than by referring to other phenomena, which also nobody but himself and his infatuated adherents pretend to have observed, and which, if most distantly confirmed, would produce far greater and more extensive changes in all the relations of human society than any discovery, not excepting even the art of printing and the discovery of Columbus. It is obvious that no science, no art, no occupation or situation of private or social life, from the most peaceful to the most warlike, would remain unchanged and unbenefited to the highest degree, if this statement of the "great benefactor of mankind" were true. Volumes filled only with the description of all the changes and blessings, arising from *this* discovery, would be insufficient to exhaust the subject. What a benefit for travellers, since they would require only to provide themselves, at the commencement of their long journey, with a bottle of good madeira, which is certainly a natural production, and a medicinal fluid too, (Organon p. 73) from which they can have every day a few glasses; if they are careful to supply the bottle with pure water;—nay! the madeira will,

by the "agitation" caused in riding, &c. probably become changed into a much nobler and milder sort of wine, perhaps into old hock, champaign, or lacrymæ christi; since, according to homœopathia, "medicines which had undergone these operations, no longer pos-"sessed those long continued effects of a prejudicial character, "which we so frequently have to witness from the crude articles, "(see Dr. Hering, l. c. p. 14) and (on p. 20), it was the energy, "the virtue only which was thereby so astonishingly unfolded."*

* Homœopathists will consider these deductions, from Hahnemann's assertions, as misrepresentations, since he says expressly, (Organon, p. 299) that the actions of wine and alcohol are diminished by sufficient dilutions; but, if we remember his suggestions quoted above, about the use of wine as a powerful remedy in inflammatory diseases, and reflect with impartiality on his doctrine about the devolopment of virtues from all natural substances, the reader will find our deductions not to be far-fetched. Since these remarks were written, we have read the "Letter to the physicians of "France, on homœopathia, by Count des Guidi, M. D., translated from the French "by Dr. William Channing, New-York, 1834." Similar to all those works on homœopathia, which are mostly composed by Counts, Barons, Chevaliers d'industrie, and similar personages, this is also one of the flattest literary productions we have ever seen from an obscure man, and, even up to the modest comparison of Hahnemann with Galileo and Columbus, almost a fac simile of Dr. Hering's Concise View. We confess, that we never heard before that such a man existed, though we can boast of some knowledge of modern foreign literature, and we were indeed not more fortunate in our inquiries of other medical men. We should think also that the zealous translator, who was not only anxious to make his countrymen minutely acquainted with all the titles, dignities and functions of his author, but also, in his motto, invoked the "heavens" for his admired new healing art, would have, at least, mentioned the other medical works which have emanated from the pen of Monsieur le Docteur Count des Guidi, if such exists, or to have proved his high standing in the profession by facts. But the able translator appears to have been so much enchanted with the acuteness and consistency displayed in this letter, that, excepting a few pathetic introductory lines, he abstained from all remarks. The conclusions, which we have drawn above, in regard to the virtues developed from nourishment, are also confirmed by this author, who became enraptured with this new medical doctrine, because his wife was cured by it; he does not say exactly of what disease. He teaches us, on page 16, that wine or coffee, *diluted with water or milk, stimulates and intoxicates* more easily and strongly, than if taken unmixed. To prove these experiments observed by him, he emphatically exclaims, on page 20: "Life! how little matter it sometimes demands "for its resuscitation, even in that function which is most strictly and servilely bound "to matter, Nutrition? See that man sinking with weariness and hunger; repose "and abundant aliment are indispensable, fully to restore his exhausted forces and to "repair his withered and impoverished organs; and yet a single mouthful of bread, a "piece of sugar, a spoonful of wine, a mere alimentary atom, when compared with "the wants of his case, will forthwith revive, and for some hours sustain those failing "masses, inspiring with a breath of vigour that vast machine shattered and falling "into ruins." Does this Monsieur le Count Docteur, and his able translator, consider a mouthful of bread to be a homœopathic dose? If so, the loaf to which it belonged would cover, at least, all Europe. Could any inference be drawn from his remark, except the common experience, that if a lamp is about to be extinguished from want of oil, it will be revived for a short time by a few drops of it? He adds also, on page 16, in support of homœopathia, a quotation from Dr. St. Marie, who appeared to have some notions of homœopathia, without knowing any thing of Hahnemann and his doctrine, and who found it so striking that, "Cullen had already re-"marked, that calves were better nourished and more easily fatted, when the milk "with which they were fed, was diluted with an equal quantity of water, than when "given to them without dilution." Is that an argument for the correctness of homœopathic doses? Is it not known to every body, that men as well as animals, and even plants, grow thin and sickly, when *too richly* fed, or in *too* rich a soil, but stout and healthy, when fed and nourished with due regard to their digestive and assimilative

Farther, there would be no danger of famine in countries possessing merely the slightest nutritious substance, and good water or sugar of milk, since a small quantity of spirituous drink, by its immensely developed virtue, might take the place, for some time, of substantial food. We have reason to hope also, that this valuable discovery will soon be completed by the art of "potenzis-" ing" from a few grains of wheat, corn or rice, or a few crumbs of stale bread, nourishing virtues sufficient for millions of men.*

powers? does he not know that all living organized beings are nourished, not by the ingesta, but by the digesta, and that we shall find the old proverb, "omne nimium vertitur in contrarium," confirmed here also. Are the expressions, to be healthy and fat, synonymous? Is he so ignorant of physiology as not to know, that all substances, which retard the lively circulation of the blood, and which weaken to a certain degree the constitution of animals, may favour obesity, which is therefore already considered by Cœlius Aurelianus as a morbid symptom, and as a disease? The justly celebrated Bichat, likewise, in his excellent *Anatomie Generale*, considers, very correctly, obesity as arising from the *weakness* of the absorbent vessels; Darwin, and many other distinguished physicians, also regarded it as the consequence of *debility*. Does he not know an old experiment frequently tried by European farmers, and often quoted by physiologists, if we are not mistaken, even by Albertus Haller, in his physiology, that calves and other domestic animals, are *frequently bled* to make them *more fat*? Is bleeding therefore, also, in his opinion, as good a homœopathic remedy, to become "better nourished and more easily fatted," as starving; though both are so much condemned by homœopathists? Indeed! the ratiocinations of these philosophers are so very singular, that the author of homœopathia, or one of his disciples, would benefit mankind by publishing also a new system of logic, as we have reason to expect from their pre-eminent mathematical talents, a new theory of magnitudes, a new arithmetic, &c.—The Americans learn also from Monsieur le Count Docteur des Guidi, that they possess numerous schools for homœopathia, and as his report has been translated, published, and its statements therefore silently admitted by one of their own professional men, they will of course be credited abroad. Such are the common manœuvres of these popular authors on homœopathia; to make themselves mutually conspicuous as eminent authors and practitioners, and to prove the rapid increase of their party in all countries, they say in America, that in Germany, France, Italy, &c. the first and oldest medical men have zealously adopted this new healing art; in the countries mentioned they say, in return, the same of America. Mendacia reciproca, et ex utraque parte, quandoque magno usui esse possunt.—*Livius.*

* Since these lines were written, we have again been delighted with a new and striking proof of the great blessings of homœopathia, promoted by its faithful votaries in this new world. We were not aware that "the great philosopher, who has beaten a "new path on all sides," and is constantly labouring for discovering "great truths," had condescended to direct his attention, most graciously, to the science of cookery, and to the developement of virtues from some substances, which we thought to be below his sphere, and that he really has commenced what our sanguine hopes only anticipated above. A *homœopathic chocolate* is publicly recommended by the leading homœopathists in Philadelphia and this city, Drs. Constantine Hering, Hans B. Gramm, John F. Gray, and Wm. Channing, as preferable for sick and weak persons to any other preparation of this article. Dr. Hering states in his certificate, that this homœopathic chocolate is made exactly according to Hahnemann's prescription, communicated to the manufacturer, and that as it is less oleaginous than other kinds, it deserves particularly to be used also for children. Unable to find in Hahnemann's works a chocolate of his invention, and supposing, therefore, that he was pleased to communicate his new arcanum solely to his particularly beloved disciples, we can only make a few conjectures about it. The diminution or exclusion of the *oleaginous* part of cocoa, by which it is rendered *less rich* for the stomach, has long been recommended and practised; the manufacturers, by an easy and cheap process, gain the oleaginous part, or, as it is called, the butter of cocoa, which is particularly mild and less subject than similar substances to become rancid, and therefore is worth more than the cocoa itself; hence the homœopathic chocolate should be cheaper than any

We dare not allude any further to the immense changes which will take place in the political condition of nations, when all fear of famine is entirely removed. What a blessing to poor poople, if there are any hereafter who can be so called, that benevolence can be exercised towards them so cheaply! A large family may for years daily enjoy the same bottle of wine, provided they will only develope its virtues! We know not how the temperance societies will be able to counteract intemperance, which we see is again thus indirectly promoted by homœopathia!—All governments, and especially those of the United States, should henceforth prohibit any passenger, travelling any great distance by mail, from carrying any medicinal fluid with him, since a small vial of an innocent cordial, or even a solution of one grain of table salt, may become changed, after such a shaking, into an immensely developed power of the most violent poison, the smell of which, "by its intensely "raised energy," might kill thousands of men!—We will seriously mention what would long since, probably, have been the inevitable consequences, if only a homœopathic fraction of this frantic nonsense were true. No animal could exist on the shores of a large lake, if only one grain of arsenic, or one poisoned rat had accidentally fallen into it, during a moderately shaking hurricane. If a small package of this, or of any similar soluble and strong

prepared cocoa. If a homœopathic dose of any drug be mysteriously mixed in each portion, the price cannot possibly be enhanced by it, since, even if it were many million times dearer than the purest gold, one grain of such a drug would be by far too much, if our whole globe, with all its continents, islands, mountains, oceans, lakes, &c. were transmuted into homœopathic chocolate. If this chocolate consists merely in the homœopathically developed virtue of the fruit of the nobleTheobroma, the price of course ought also to be less, as the labour of rubbing down such an atom cannot much increase the value of any cheap unmedicinal substance added. But, nevertheless, this chocolate is dearer, its taste is less agreeable, (at least for our own allopathic palate), and it is apparently, in every respect, an article *far inferior* to many others of that kind prepared in this or any other country. What is the cause of this higher price? Avoiding conjectures, pardonable in those who remember the *alcali pneum*, the *arcanum* against scarlet fever, and the introductory lines to the work on chronic diseases above mentioned, &c. of the old benefactor of mankind, we believe that it is only to sustain the homœopathic maxim, in regard to the inverse ratio between matter, (the *quality* of cocoa) and *power*, (its price.) We hope that either the "old "philosopher" himself, or some of his disciples, who combine with their distinguished professional talents and acquirements an *apician* taste for cookery, will soon apply them in benefiting the people of this free country with homœopathic cakes, pastries, pies, sausages, &c. so that "a treasure like this new art may quickly be estimated in a de- "gree commensurate with its real value; sooner than by the kings and princes of "Europe, who impede the progress of the new art by processes, penalties and bay- "onets," (see Dr. Hering, l. c. p. 29); and who do not deserve to have a taste even of these homœopathic delicacies, unless they soon rescind their processes, penalties and bayonets, and humbly submit to Samuel Hahnemann and his heavenly doctrine! as he, himself, calls his discoveries, saying, on page 7, Vol. III. of his Materia Medica, with Virgil, "ignea inest illis vis et colestis origo."

poisonous substance, had ever been swept from a wreck into the ocean during a tornado, by which we think it would be as well shaken, as a small vial is by a stout man's arm in a few minutes; all fishes, and all monsters of the deep, not excepting even the large sea-serpent, would long since have died.* No human being, or other animal, could live in or near any place, where large chemical factories of corrosive sublimate, blue vitriol, &c. are situated. Water, which has only run for a short time through copper or leaden pipes, would seriously injure many, as every one will admit that water propelled by steam or any other power, will develope the noxious properties of copper or lead in a few seconds, more than can be done in several hours by a stout man. According to Hahnemann's opinion in regard to the great divisibility of all contagious matter, which he cites in support of his developed drug-virtues, no contagious disease, adhering even to letters at a distance of many hundred miles, could ever become extinct, and one rabid dog thrown into a large river, would infect all those who bathe in it, when their bodies are but slightly scratched. If a person should have taken one grain or less of table salt, or should accidentally have swallowed, during dinner, a similarly small quantity of charcoal, both of which occur to many persons daily, and, instead of taking a nap afterwards, should take a ride, he must either be instantly killed, or be affected with some of the 895 serious and dangerous symptoms produced by the virtue developed from table-salt, or of the 930 of those produced from charcoal, (see Chr. Dis.

* It appears from Hahnemann's Materia Medica, 2d ed. vol. vi. p. 4. that the danger arising from one grain of a medicinal substance falling into a large lake has been already objected to him. He answers in his usual dictatorial manner, that such objections are utterly foolish, because the mixture in ever so large a quantity of water could never be so intimate as in each solution, made separately by two strong shakes, viz. "*with the arm from above downwards.*" (See Organon, p. 299, note.)—From below upwards would not answer this purpose.———We leave this his defence to the judgment of those who have witnessed a stiff breeze at sea, to say nothing of a hurricane, and who may justly believe that the many millions of grains of salts, etc. dissolved in the ocean, might have been shaken enough, in the course of centuries, to make each drop of sea-water a strong homœopathic drug or poison, as well as the few shakings of a solution of one grain of table-salt by the arm of a homœopathist, "*from above downwards,*" can develope a virtue so efficacious that it must be *inhaled* only *once every month.*—Dr. Hering must have had an uncommonly pleasant voyage, when coming from Europe, otherwise we should think his opinion about the virtue developed by shaking the bottle would have been shaken also.—We once accidentally noticed in Fr. Bacon's works, on page 429, in vol. ii. of the new London ed. of 1824, a singular passage, which we could not explain, but which appears to be connected perhaps with an old English saying about shaking the bottle.—"Many men," he says, "especially such as affect gravity, have a manner, after other men's speeches, to "shake their heads. A great officer of this land would say, It was as men shake a "bottle, to see if there were any wits in their heads or no."

Vol. IV. pp. 67 and 334.) Only a man, like Hahnemann, who considers his wretched knowledge the highest wisdom, and his miserable aid to be far superior to the operations of nature, which he regards (as he expresses himself in the preface to his Organon), as "unavailing, contrary to reasonable design and without sense," could believe also, that his arms, or those of his faithful adepts, are better able to develope the drug-virtues from table-salt, charcoal, flint, &c. than the stomach, especially when its muscular action is supported by the fast trotting of a horse, or any similar exercise; an action, so powerful in itself, that nothing in art is to be compared with it, when we consider that by it, and by the chemical influence of the gastric and other digestive juices, a homogeneous, mild and salutary pulp is prepared from perhaps fifty heterogeneous kinds of food and drink at a fashionable dinner, and which, according to Fontana, destroys also the virus of the viper; while Bosquillon states, that even the hydrophobic matter loses its fatal properties; a power which Paracelsus, (this truly eminent man, who resembled Hahnemann only in quackery, which however was more pardonable in him, considering the age in which he lived) so highly appreciated, terming this power, "the great master "of alchymy in the stomach."*

To crown all the absurdities which the instances alleged in confirmation of this maxim of homœopathia offer, we shall amuse our readers with one more statement of the many which Dr. Hering probably forgot to quote in his unparalleled panegyrics of the competitor of "Galileo and Columbus." (C. V. pp. 9, 10.)

A German, one of the many unprofessional men who are infatuated with the homœopathic doctrine and delighted with its practice, probably a disciple of Hahnemann, has taken the very great trouble to prepare, partly in snow- and partly in spring-water, exactly according to the direction of Hahnemann, the *fifteen hundredth* dilution of sulphur, and pretends to have found *very distinct* me-

* One lie always leads to another. Hahnemann's assertion in regard to the immense changes produced in the fluid preparations of all medical substances by their transmission from place to place, is so extravagant, that he must have been obliged to make this statement as a consequence of his developed drug-virtues, just as the latter was forced upon him by his second maxim. We have seen that this maxim, or his false interpretation of similia similibus curantur originated with him, after accidentally observing, that the symptoms produced in healthy persons by drugs, resembled those of some natural dis eases: as allopathic doses used in such a manner would injure, he was obliged to reduce these doses to almost nothing; and then, to explain their action, he was forced to broach the doctrine of developed drug-virtues. Now, if these drug-virtues had been developed merely by two shakes downwards, it would have appeared too palpably like magic or witchcraft; and to do away with this impression, he says, the virtues are developed also by transmission from place to place.

dical virtues in *one drop* of this presumed solution. Hahnemann, in a postscript to a public statement of this unique experiment, (see Archiv fuer homœopathische Heilkunde, vol. xi. no. 2. p. 87. according to the quotation of Dr. Kopp, l. c. p. 71), fully agrees with the author in the marvellous operation of this dilution; though he adds, (Chr. Dis. vol. iv. p. 338), that the 30th dilution of sulphur may not only be considered as the mildest, but also as the most developed preparation of this substance.——Now let the reader observe, that sulphur is considered, by all ancient and modern chemists, to be insoluble in water; further that, admitting even the snow-water to be quite pure, and sulphur to be soluble in water, the purest spring water contains, when compared with the 1500th dilution of sulphur, an *immense surplus* of earths, salts, iron, and other ingredients, almost all of which are considered by Hahnemann as *powerful medicinal substances*, from which drug-virtues must become developed *by the same process:* furthermore, that the 1500 vials of glass, or any similar substance probably used in this experiment, would likewise impart to the solution, by the 3000 necessary shakes, a proportionally much larger quantity of potash, and particularly of silicea, this powerful homœopathic remedy, unless these drugs and remedial agents are excluded by miracles or witchcraft: and last, not least, that this 1500th dilution of one grain is equal to *one divided by one with* 3000 *zeros*, or is the 3000th power of ten!

It is easily ascertained, that the very large number, expressing the distance of the nearest fixed star, Syrius, from our globe, in inches or any considerably small fraction of an inch, is a mere trifle, and less than any imaginable small magnitude, in comparison with this fraction; and that the distance from our globe to any heavenly body, observable only by the greatest refractor existing, even expressed by inches or geometrical lines, would also appear a trifle, when compared to the 3000th power of ten.*—Who would not exclaim, on seeing such unparalleled nonsense in print:—*Helleborum hisce hominibus opus est!*

* The greatest diameter of our globe being 595,072,000, let us say one with nine zeros in inches; the greatest distance of the sun from our globe being 2800 times as much, his distance in inches is 1,666,201,600,000, or about one with twelve zeros; Syrius, according to Huygen's calculation, is about 30,000 times this distance, or 30000000000000000 in inches; we will say, one with 17 zeros: this number is less by one with 43 zeros, when compared with Hahnemann's usual 30th dilution, and by one with 2983 zeros less than the above-mentioned 1500th dilution of one grain of sulphur.

" Somnia, terrores magicos, miracula, sagas,
" Nocturnos lemures, portentaque Thessala."——*Hor.*

We would advise the enlightened member of the chamber of deputies in Baden, who insisted upon having a professorship exclusively for the homœopathic doctrine at Heidelberg, (the oldest and most distinguished university in Germany, founded in 1346, which always was, and still is, particularly at present, distinguished for the most ingenious and talented professors of medicine and surgery); as we also would recommend to all the admirers and amateurs of homœopathia, to take a slate and pencil, and ascertain what the homœopathic remedies, their dilutions, triturations, doses, potenzised powers and developed virtues really are. If they are not cured of their mental disease by this simple experiment, nothing in the world can cure them.

By the aid of numbers, to be found in every work on astronomy, they can easily ascertain, that if the whole planetary system, the sun, planets and all their moons, should be changed into pure water, alcohol or sugar of milk, and one grain of any substance should be dissolved in this immense mass of fluid, or be minutely triturated with its solids, every drop or grain of such a solution or mixture, would be a fraction of the whole mass, equal only to one divided by one with about fifty zeros, or by one with ten zeros less than the homœopathic thirtieth dilution, generally prescribed by Samuel Hahnemann; and yet he advises explicitly, that even less should be given. As he prescribes one drop of the sixtieth dilution of the juice of Thuya occidentalis, (see Materia Medica, 2d edition, vol. v. p. 123) this dose is therefore still far smaller than one drop of the planetary system would be, if homœopathically medicated, in the manner mentioned!—We challenge all mankind to name another instance in the sciences, arts, &c., where a man has asserted similar nonsense, and has not been considered fully entitled to a place in the lunatic asylum!—Never can, never will posterity believe, that in the 19th century, which has scarcely passed its first quarter, and may already boast of the greatest progress in natural sciences, a Samuel Hahnemann has not only been respected as an author, but has been entrusted with the life and health of his fellow-men, and has been considered by many, who claim a respectable standing in the profession, as "a reformer of practical "medicine, as one of the greatest philosophers, medical geniusses, "and benefactors of mankind!"

Let every one calmly and impartially reflect on the intensive and extensive importance of the unparalleled absurdities of the homœopathic doctrine, and not be surprised by the *ruse de guerre* which its fanatic advocates generally use, in admitting its extravagant and uncommon bearings; let them not be deterred from a minute scrutiny of this horrid disgrace of the human mind and of our age, when they read such tirades as Dr. Hering employs in the introduction to his Concise View, on page 3, to prepossess the mind of the reader in favor of his all-curing new art of healing. "He to "whom the Hahnemannean system of medicine is new, and who "is at once brought to survey it as a whole, must be struck by its "peculiarities. Indeed, it differs so extraordinarily from any to "which he has hitherto been accustomed, that at the first glance "he would be prone to regard it with distrust; while at the same "time, its colossal dimensions, the monstrous compass of its fun-"damental principles wear a discouraging aspect," &c.

The principal topics which we have selected from Hahnemann's works will prove not only, that his developed drug-virtues must be considered by all men of common sense, either as nonentities and chimeras, or as powers different from any in nature which we hitherto know, and that Hahnemann is in nothing more correct than in asserting, that he discovered a *world of new powers*, a *glorified* state of substances, an *immense multitude of miracles!* He ought therefore not to have used the term *potenzised*, since this expression would admit the idea, that these powers or virtues have been *latent* before they were disenthralled. We repeat, his virtues developed from drugs must be considered absolutely as newly created; created only by homœopathic manipulations, since it is impossible by any other physical or chemical process, which has been hitherto, or ever will be known, to develope powers which can be in the least compared with them. In addition to the reasons which we have already alleged, we must therefore declare that no man was ever more inconsistent than Hahnemann, when to support the validity of his doctrine, he used in so many instances the statements of others in respect to the treatment with allopathic doses of drugs, and did not consider that his trials with drugs on healthy persons, have been made with much larger doses than allopathists have ever prescribed; while in natural diseases he uses also drugs prepared in a manner never heard of before, and according to his own assertion, so widely different from their crude state and prejudicial

character. Who, for instance, would refer to experiments with the ore of any metal, to confirm the truth of other experiments made with the pure metal, and yet the metallic contents of the ore which are merely oxydated, sulphuretted, or otherwise chemically combined with other minerals in the ore, do not require any miraculous transmutation into a glorified state, or into a spirit to become pure: could any one, for example, judge of the poisonous effect of one grain of deutochloras hydrargyri or corrosive sublimate, from the comparative mildness of the natural cinnabar, and still much less from metallic mercury, which can be taken by pounds without injury? In both cases Hahnemann will admit that no homœopathic virtues whatever were developed from these drugs, since otherwise he could not have asserted, that his triturations and shakings only can develope his infinite spirits, and much less, that to obtain the true salutary glorified potenz, the 18th dilution was at least required. According to the conceptions hitherto adopted in scientific language, a potenzised power does not differ in its nature from what it has been originally, but is only a *higher degree of the same*, either extensively or intensively. On the contrary, if a power is changed into another, it cannot be called *potenzised* but *altered*. A piece of flint for instance, (an example improperly used by Hahnemann, when explaining his developed drug-virtues, since it is the steel and not the flint which becomes ignited by the friction,) canont be considered as an igniting substance, before the spark is drawn from it by friction and by the influence of the oxygene of the atmosphere;—the flint (the steel) contains the caloric in its bound state, but being bound by the specific capacity of both bodies, it does not exist as free caloric or as fit for ignition; it might also be developed by any process and to any extent, but without a medium favorable for its ignition, it will never ignite, and with the aid of this medium only, caloric is liberated, by friction, to a degree promoting ignition, but it is not changed by this process into another matter; it is exactly the same agent which it was before. Nobody will therefore think the caloric and the property of any combustible substance of becoming ignited, to be newly created by the process mentioned, or to depend essentially on the larger or smaller bulk of the substance; and much less, that in conformity with the homœopathically developed virtues, from a smaller piece of such a substance more caloric, and consequently a larger spark could be developed than from a larger

one, or that the ratio between ignition and bulk must be considered as inverse.

It is evident, that according to Hahnemann's assertions about this subject, any quantity of a drug, from which no virtue is developed by his manipulations, must be considered as an inert substance, or at least so, in regard to the homœopathic property which it would possess when properly manipulated;—the substance, be it ever so large, must be regarded as equally ineffective in respect to its medical property, as mountains of a combustible substance are in regard to their igniting property, until their specific capacity for caloric, which they may contain in ever so large a quantity, is diminished in a sufficient degree, and under circumstances favorable to ignition; thus for instance, millions of pounds of gunpowder may be safely stored in vaults of flint and iron.

The gross jargon quoted above, from page 14 of the Concise View, and from Hahnemann's different writings, cannot free homœopathists from admitting implicitly, that their developed drug-virtues, if they exist, are *created* by their manipulations, and immensely *differ* from those qualities which the drugs possessed in their crude state.* Though most of them would not object to

* Among the many examples drawn from common occurrences by homœopathists, which we have proved to be delusive and false, we observe in Monsieur le Count Docteur Des Guidi's letter the following, on page 19, "but though all these precedents "should fail us at once" (he means those mentioned in our earlier note; and similar ones of minor importance) "would not the experiment of Spallanzani alone, upon the "diffusibility of the spermatic fluid of the frog, compel us to see nothing incredible in "the power of homœopathic doses?" Here we see again a very nice specimen of the grossest paralogism which these close-thinking men proffer, when they, for the defence of their doctrine, allude, in the manner of their master, to common-place instances. One drop of the spermatic fluid of a frog fructifies many thousand frog-eggs: the 30th developed virtue of a drug is immensely less in bulk and weight than the bulk and weight of a sick person to be cured by the drug; ergo, its developed virtue must be considered as a never-failing powerful remedy.—Should Monsieur le Count Docteur Des Guidi, or his able translator, have ever fructified, by their developed virtue, one frog-egg, we would believe that they can always fructify frog eggs, and even all other kinds of eggs; but nobody can conceive what similarity, and much less what identity exists between a non-fructified frog-egg and a disease? What could not be proved by such singular syllogisms and such reasoning as is here adopted? The spermatic fluid of the frog is much more substantial than the *aura seminalis* in animals of a higher order; and as far as we can judge of these great mysteries of organized life, the spermatic fluid, or the aura seminalis, kindles the latent nisus formativus at one point, and this kindling spark, once developed, extends in those cases, at the next moment likewise to the next point, where more organized matter is ready for its fructification; and so on, as long as such matter, the nisus formativus of which is matured exists; just as one spark will explode many million pounds of gunpowder in a moment, without igniting every grain separately. Must therefore this little spark, which, when extinguished in time will do no injury, be considered as possessed of an immensely or infinitely developed quantity of caloric? In the same manner we may, mutatis mutandis, explain infection by an inconsiderable quantity of small or cow-pox matter, which is likewise a favourite topic of homœopathists to prepossess ignorant men for their fancifully small doses: it is however clear, that here also the vi-

medical witchcraft, we shall nevertheless try to prove this more pl inly by the following apagogical demonstration, or deductio ad absurdum.

The homœopathic drug-virtue can be either less or greater, or equal to the power of a correspondent allopathic dose, which has not been manipulated.—If both are *equal*, then the homœopathic treatment is on the same footing with the allopathic, with regard to the dose; that is, one decillionth part of a grain of a drug will operate always in the same manner, whether developed or not; and the whole doctrine of developed virtues must be admitted as nonsensical, or as a wilful deception. Hahnemann and his fol-

rus itself does not become distributed over the whole body, but only a diseased process is kindled in a small point in the lungs by inhalation, or on the skin by absorption, etc. and then spreads over all those parts naturally disposed for this morbid process; which disposition however is generally for ever extinguished by the specific changes in the reproductive system, as consequences of the morbid process itself. Without such a participation of the whole system, manifested by a feverish reaction, neither small nor cow-pox can therefore protect against another identical infection. The allusion of homœopathists to the divisibility of the small-pox virus by the air, for the defence of their doses, leads to the same paralogism just mentioned. Their argument is this, that because one phenomenon, presenting a great effect on the human body, can only be explained by a great divisibility of matter, therefore the different drug-virtues, being developed from matter minutely divided, must also be infinitely effectual. Abstracting from the validity of their statements, of which we shall soon speak, these ratiocinations should rest on their own intrinsic correctness: but then they must consistently prove by other incontrovertible experiments than those which are to be proved by it, that the effects of their drugs are not lessened, but increased by their immense division or developement, unlike those of other bodies, for instance, musk, gold, etc., which, though exceedingly divisible, lose their effects, as all bodies do, in direct proportion to their weight or mechanical division. Because a small fraction of one substance has some effect, we have no right to conclude the same in regard to another, without sufficient proof that the other operates iu the same manner; otherwise all substances being immensely divisible, must operate on the human body alike; and instead of using instances so far fetched, the homœopathists need only to declare in favour of Bonnet's Theory of Generation per emboitement; according to which, all vegetables and animals which have existed and shall exist, were inclosed in the first grain of seed, or the first drop of spermatic fluid; which presents a more striking instance of a great divisibility than any similar one. The instance of small-pox proves nothing in favour of the operations of infinite small homœopathic doses, and the inoculation of cow-pox is still less conclusive, as even the many thousandth part of a drop cannot be considered a homœopathic dose, as we have already stated, in many places. Both instances of small-pox, as well as cow-pox, admit still less of any sound comparison with homœopathic drugs, because both do not operate absolutely and unconditionally: for if this were the case, every individual would be subject to an infection in a small-pox epidemic, and every vaccination must be successful: farther, in both, the developement, is performed without the aid of mechanical operation; and also, the small-and cow-pox protect against a return of the same disease, a property never as yet attributed to the homœopathic drug-virtues. Admitting, however, even that the homœopathic doses operate as certainly as the small-pox virus itself, still an essential dissimilarity exists between both of them, inasmuch as Hahnemann, adverse to all external remedies, requires for his drugs, the aid of the stomach; whereas, according to the celebrated American physician Rush, (see Observations and Inquiries, V. n. 2.) small-pox matter, like the most virulent other animal poisons, can be swallowed without infection. The infection of small-pox by letters, as alluded to by Hahnemann, is very doubtful; though, in such cases, an allopathic dose of small-pox matter might have adhered to the letter, and have remained dry, until being afterwards dissolved by a warm damp air, it was inhaled by the person susceptible to it.

lowers would do any thing rather than admit that the medical effect of any dose of a drug, where the presumed virtue is developed, is *less* than a similar dose when undeveloped; for by this, the third maxim and its superstructure would fall to the ground, and not a shadow of homœopathia would remain. It would be then evident, that they insist, merely from caprice, upon their atoms, which, thus divested from all virtues, spirits, miracles, etc. would soon lose all confidence: should they, however, follow the maxim, "similia similibus curantur," with *large* allopathic doses, their treatment would soon prove to be the most murderous which has ever existed.

The third category then only remains to be considered, viz.—that when the virtue of a drug is developed by homœopathic manipulation, a dose of it is immensely *more* powerful than a similar dose of the same drug when undeveloped; the remedial properties of both being identical, they differ only in degree; this is the case with gravitation, as, in a vacuum the feather falls to the ground as quickly as a heavy weight; and with electricity, whether developed in a small piece of sealing wax or in a thunder-cloud. But it is evident, that *some* quantity of the substance which has not been developed, must be an equivalent and produce the same effect as the 30th dilution of the developed drug; for instance, a pound of Peruvian bark must possess as much remedial virtue as the 30th developed virtue of a grain of the same. In this case it is unnecessary to adopt infinite spirits, etc, and homœopathists, by admitting this, would no longer oppose, but advocate allopathic doses; since they cannot deny that cases may exist, where the immense homœopathic virtues are too strong, and the much smaller virtues in an allopathic dose would be better. Thus, for children, they would perhaps prescribe one pound of Peruvian bark pro dosi, rather than a grain of the 30th dilution. Their reproaches of the allopathic prescriptions of large doses are then ridiculous, since, in their eyes, the allopathic doses must consistently be exceedingly small; and by this it could also be best explained why homœopathists administer one dose only once in four or six weeks.*

* Patients under homœopathic treatment are generally very much deceived, in believing that what is administered to them every day is medicine: they frequently take a true homœopathic dose of a drug only once in one, two, or even in six weeks.—They can easily ascertain this by observing, that among ten, twenty, or more small doses, which they receive, one or two are marked to be taken on a certain day. Faith-

The whole privilege which Hahnemann thought to secure for his developed drug-virtues, as always acting absolutely, unconditionally, &c., opposite to the vital powers, which always act senseless, clumsy, &c. would fall to the ground, when he must admit that the substances which nature offers to him, are without his co-operation, though in proportionally larger doses, not less salutary than with it.

Whereas, therefore, the medical properties of all simple drugs are, according to homœopathia, in no quantity, either *equal* to, or *more*, or *less* than the corresponding doses of *the same* drugs with their virtues homœopathically developed, and whereas, also, as we have seen, the developed drug-virtues are not to be compared with *any power* in nature hitherto known; it follows, that they are not only to be considered as powers sui generis, but as *supernatural* powers, they may be termed miracles, spirits, &c. and the manipulations themselves chiromancy, witchcraft, &c.

Should it ever be proved that Hahnemann's mysterious manipulations have only been a subterfuge to save his maxim, similia similibus curantur, from its downfall, on account of the great injuries of large doses when given in accordance with that maxim, and that he believes the difference between the homœopathic and allopathic treatment, not to consist in the *immensely increased* power of the drug, but only in the *absolute smallness* of the homœopathic doses, than he has wantonly exposed the lives of many healthy persons to the greatest danger, by experimenting on them with immense doses of drugs, as he did for instance, with four ounces of powdered bark, mixed with twenty ounces of alcohol;—a quantity which, when compared with the thirtieth dilution of one grain, would be far more than sufficient to destroy all living animals in

ful homœopathists are bound by their doctrine to act in this manner, and to give in the intermediate hours, days, or weeks, only a small quantity of sugar of milk, which they themselves consider as nothing. Hahnemann, probably from his great respect for truth only, does not permit his followers to relieve the anxiety of their patients by naming the disease distinctly, and advises them, as we have seen, to use only the term, "a kind of such or such a complaint:" but nevertheless he directs his followers to deceive their patients, as he usually does, by giving, for many days or weeks, doses of sugar of milk under the name of medicine; though no practitioners had ever less reason to deceive their patients, in order to operate favourably upon their minds, than homœopathists; for when, as they assert, all nature cannot disturb the marvellous operations of their drug-virtues during four or six weeks, what evil could be apprehended from causing the patient a little anxiety by telling him the truth? When speaking on this subject, (See Chr. Dis. vol. i. p. 216.) the old sinner adds, very piously, "for this purpose I consider sugar of milk an invaluable gift of God." What a contrast with the honourable Dr. Mead, who, thankful for the great remedial properties of Peruvian bark, termed this drug, "*Magnum Dei donum.*"

our whole planetary system by bark-fever or ague, if their nature is similar to that of man. The only defence which Hahnemann could make, is the great difference between the healthy and diseased state, by which he proved that *much weaker* medical virtues are required to produce a drug-sickness in the former, than to cure the latter. But if he will admit the exact proportion between power and its end, wisely adapted to each other in nature, and also that many recover without any aid from serious diseases, for instance, from intermittent fever, it follows that in these cases the ratio of the vital powers, which take the place of his immensely developed drug-virtues, to the natural disease, must be the same as the ratio of these immensely developed virtues to the natural diseases cured by them; or also the same, as the ratio between the immense developed virtue of a small homœopathic dose, and the undeveloped, though (in weight) much larger, allopathic dose. The same reasoning will be applicable, mutatis mutandis, if he should assert, that the medical properties *decrease* immensely by homœopathic developements; the instances just quoted would then also be no less inexplicable, especially if we should admit as true, his singular conceptions about the impotence of the vital powers in the cure of all diseases; for, if the vital powers are reduced so immensely as his drug-virtues then are, how could they do any thing, and much less, how could they remove without any medical assistance any serious disease, as they however do?—Hahnemann therefore must admit, that two doses of any drug, equal in weight, are also equal in their medical strength or virtue, whether they are or are not homœopathically developed, or by this second deductio ad absurdum it is also conclusively proved, that in his developed or potenzised doses, for instance, of Peruvian bark, Belladonna, table salt, &c., the original natural properties of these substances *have ceased* to exist, and that they are replaced by other ones, newly created by his homœopathic manipulations; and since nothing like them exists in nature, he must term them, as he explicitly does, miracles, a new creation, a glorified state of substances, spirits, &c.

Ridiculous as all homœopathia, but especially as the doctrine of developed drug-virtues must appear to every impartial reader, whenever he has become closely acquainted with it, and trivial as it may seem to many, whether the public are in favor of one or the other method of medical treatment; it must be extremely impor-

tant to every lover of truth in general, if he reflects on the serious consequences which may arise from such a horrid superstition. To day, Hahnemannism may be considered merely as a medical doctrine, to which as many, or even less, may fall victims than to any other medical doctrine or mode of treatment; to-morrow, it may easily affect the welfare and happiness of mankind in one way or another, though not directly by its professional features. The history of man proves sadly, that credulity and superstition have been comparatively of almost greater and more lasting injury to the welfare and happiness of society, than truth has been of benefit. Considering the extended intercourse of the medical profession with the people, we assert that, besides the immediate injury of health and life, no medium exists, by which the spreading of obnoxious superstitions can be more promoted, and all the blessings of truth be more counteracted and annihilated, than by a medical doctrine which demands implicit belief in miracles; especially when they are seemingly supported by false or delusive statements.

It is very curious, that in our enlightened age these evident consequences of the homœopathic doctrine should have been unnoticed so long; though this Abracadabra is far more guilty of the named obnoxious influences, than its innocent predecessor was in ages long past. Let people, disposed to credulity and superstition from want of education, or a propensity to the extraordinary and marvellous, believe that a privileged class of men, or they themselves, can develope immense powers by certain manipulations, or any other processes so easily performed, from an atom of flint, table salt, arsenic, or any other substance; let these powers be said to belong to a new discovered world of potenzised, glorified and miraculous powers or spirits; let it be believed that these powers operate more absolutely and unconditionally than any power known to us in nature; let it further be believed that through the actions of these artificially developed powers, men can generate an immense number of bodily and mental disorders, from a small wart or pimple up to abortion, hernia, apoplexy, &c., from the slightest sensations of grief and affliction to suicide and murder; let us admit the truth of all these mad and abominable assertions, plainly expressed by Hahnemann, and publicly admitted by his followers as the highest wisdom and truth; and we shall soon witness again the horrid consequences of implicit faith in all kinds of miracles and witchery, which for so many centuries resisted and frustrated

the blessings of an enlightening religion and philosophy, and which rendered the human race so miserable.

For those who might think us unjust or sophistical, notwithstanding all our quotations and remarks, we feel obliged to quote only one other assertion from Hahnemann, which alone would be fully sufficient for our defence. Speaking, in the introduction to the sixth volume of his Materia Medica, of the powers developed from metallic gold by triturating and diluting it twelve times with sugar of milk, he asserts: "that one quadrillionth part of a grain," (that is, a fraction of a grain, equal to one divided by one with twenty-four zeros), "is so powerful, that a person suffering by me-"lancholy, despising life, and inclined, from insupportable anguish, "to commit suicide, has merely to smell a few minutes of a vial, "containing one grain of the just mentioned solution, and this "wretched being will, in one hour, be delivered from his evil spirit," (demon) "and the full love of life and cheerful temper will again "be awakened in him." Will homœopathists, will these fanatics deny, that they implicitly believe in witchcraft, when they believe such ravings as trustworthy facts; or, if they do not believe them, will they deny that they premeditatedly impose upon the public, by recommending this "new art of healing," as the only safe one which rests on "incontrovertible truth," and by proclaiming its author as one of the greatest medical geniuses and benefactors of mankind.

"Once more Democritus arise on earth,
"With cheerful wisdom and instructive mirth,
"See motley life in modern trappings dress'd,
"And feed with varied fools th' eternal jest."—*Johnson.*

We must therefore direct the particular attention of all men, anxious to promote truth, and to check the progress of credulity and superstition, in whatever shape they may appear, and under whatever pretext they may be palmed upon the public, to watch minutely the farther progress of the homœopathic doctrine, and to enlighten those who are duped and deceived by it, if it should last longer than may be justly expected and hoped. This task will be much easier for them if they attend to the following last topic of our discussion about the third maxim of homœopathia, and examine with us, whether Hahnemann is in this maxim of his doctrine also as inconsistent with his own statements and suggestions, as we have endeavoured to prove him to be with regard to the other two.

We will therefore show, admitting the truth of Hahnemann's

experiments, statements and assertions, as premises of his conclusions, that the latter cannot be correct, since his own statements and suggestions contradict each other, and that we must, therefore, still more consider his doctrine as the highest potenzised nonsense, or as premeditated falsehood.

To say nothing of Hahnemann's impositions upon the public, as proved in the preceding pages, every impartial reader will doubt the veracity of a man who, calls the physicians of all ages murderers, and who, while attributing their cure of one patient in several hundreds only to chance, because they neglected the maxim, similia similibus curantur, and also the virtues developed from drugs, totally disregarded both himself, during most of his practice, and used larger doses of medicines than most allopathists prescribe; and this too without any clear indications.

In the same year that Hahnemann first published his ideas about homœopathia in *Hufeland's Journal of Practical Medicine*, and nine years before he issued his work, Fragmenta de Viribus Medicamentorum Positivis, Lipsiæ, &c. 1805, he empirically used the most powerful drugs, and in much larger doses than were ever recommended by any author on materia medica or therapeutics. This will be proved by his public statement of his treatment of Klokenbring, an insane man, for whom he prescribed *twenty-five grains of tartar emetic*, to be taken at once, (see Deutsche Monatschrift, February, 1796.) The year after his first suggestions of homœopathia, (see *Hufeland's* periodical just mentioned, Vol. III. 1797, p. 138,) he published a case of colic, cured by him, in which he had administered within a short time, according to *his own* statement, *Tartar emetic*, *Gamboge*, *Scammony*, *radix Filicis maris*, (*one ounce daily for four days in succession*), *Charcoal*, *Semina Cynæ*, *Colocynthis*, *Castor oil*, *Tin*, *Iron*, *Semina Sabadillæ*, *Sulphur*, *Petroleum*, *Camphor*, *Asafœtida*, *Epsom salt*, *Ipecacuanha*, *Opium*, *Oil of Cajeput*, *and*, *in addition*, *the Arcana of Nuffer and Clossius for the tape-worm*, which contain the *strongest drastics*, *and other powerful drugs in the largest doses;* and after he found himself mistaken about the presumed tape-worm, he prescribed powders, each of which contained *four grains* of *Veratrum album.—Still later*, he mentions in the same periodical, (see Vol. V. p. 40, s. 99), cases of influenza, for which he had prescribed, to adult persons, the enormous quantity of *forty grains of camphor* to be taken *within twenty-four hours*, and

fifteen grains of the same, *daily, for fourteen days*, by a boy *twelve* years old. At that time he administered Ledum palustre, one of his great homœopathic remedies, in doses of six or seven grains! though afterwards, (see Mat. Med. Vol. IV. p. 176), it was proved by him to be so extremely powerful that he was obliged to give it only in the quintillionth dilution! and so too with other drugs; powdered Peruvian bark, for instance, which he says at that time he prescribed by drachms. One of two cases must be true; either Hahnemann then knew, as his fanatic followers assert, by long experience, the salutary effect of his method generally, and particularly the beneficial effect of his small doses; and then he is, according to his own verdict, guilty of repeatedly attempting or committing murders, because he was conscious of his detrimental treatment, and yet used it to such a shocking excess; or he thought no more of homœopathia at that time, than he would of a vague idea suggested by him to the profession, and then he is guilty of the greatest falsehood in stating his new infallible method to be the result of many years thought, and of frequent experience at the bedside of patients. This, however, could not be the case, even if we allow him eight years, from 1797 to 1805, because he was, as we have stated, almost during that whole period, a wandering physician, and not engaged in any permanent practice, and the largest practice of eight years, is certainly too short a time to form an estimate in regard to any, and much less to such a medical method of treatment.

As an additional specimen of the arithmetical exactitude observed by homœopathists, it may be stated that they asserted already, many years ago, that Hahnemann had pursued his practice, in accordance with his doctrine, for upwards of 40 years, and the same is now stated publicly by the homœopathists of this country; thus we have read in the German Gazette of Philadelphia, that Hahnemann has practised homœopathia for upwards of 43 years. Of course, according to homœopathic arithmetic, 1805 deducted from 1833, leaves 43!

When Hahnemann first began to recommend homœopathia, many of his prescriptions remained intelligible and within the limits of possibility: one grain of good extract of belladonna dissolved in one, two, or three ounces of water, and given, according to his first direction, in doses of a few drops, could at least be imagined effectual, and have certainly proved so in a few extraordinary

cases. The same may be ascertained, with respect to many other drugs, by any judicious physician, who does not estimate the powers of drugs by grocer's weight, by ounces and pounds; especially to narcotics, which Hahnemann recommended formerly in similar doses. But what confidence can be placed in Hahnemann's statements, if, for instance, he publishes in the year 1815, that he had often derived *immediate and permanent* benefit from one *unmixed* drop of Bryonia juice; a few years after he asserts, that he *seldom* meets with a case, in which *one drop* of the decillionth solution, or $\frac{1}{10^{60}}$ part of one drop of the same drug, could be used without injury, and that no case exists in which the undiluted juice would be advisable; and twelve years later he states, that the patient must *smell only* of a sugar-pellet of the size of a hemp or poppy seed, moistened with the decillionth solution of the same! (see Kopp. l. c. p. 69.) In his Materia Medica, (Reine Arzneymittellehre, Vol. V. p. 122, 1827), he remarks, in regard to charcoal: that no stronger developed virtue, (Potenzierung) of charcoal is required for homœopathic use than the millionth; three years after, (1830, in the last volume of his Chronic Diseases, page 3,) he says, of the same substance: "I have used for a long time (!) the sixtillionth dilution,"—(there is, truly no little difference between one, and one sixtillionth part of one);—"until I have lately found the "*decillionth dilution the best* with which to moisten one or two "small sugar-pellets, which answers *all* desired purposes;"—that is again, even admitting the fluid required to moisten such a sugar-pellet, made of starch and sugar, equal to a full fraction of one grain, a trifling difference between one with twenty-four zeros, and one.—We would advert here again, not only to the remarkable fact that, by asserting the power or virtue to become developed at the eighteenth dilution, he has retracted all his former assertions in regard to all dilutions of a lower degree, though he has before repeatedly recommended them as infallible, but also, that he first prescribed charcoal in an immensely stronger dose in powder, and afterwards many million times weaker as a fluid, which implies, that he foolishly considers charcoal not only as soluble in alcohol or water, but more soluble than most soluble salts, though it is notoriously one of the most insoluble substances in existence. In his Mat. Med. Vol. I. p. 445, the dose of the liquid extract of aconitum is fixed by him at the octillionth dilution, and in Vol. VI. of the

same work, p. 199, in a note, he restricts this dose again for the same purpose to *smelling* once of a sugar-pellet of the usual size, and moistened only with the thirtieth dilution of the same drug; and again, in another place of the same work, (Vol. V. p. 123) he speaks of the vigesillionth dilution, that is, *one grain's weight divided by* 10^{120}.*

* Hahnemann's numerous suggestions about the increased power of all natural substances, and especially of all drugs, when properly shaken or rubbed down with unmedicinal substances, are in themselves a contradiction, because, if from all natural substances a virtue or power becomes developed, sugar of milk, alcohol or acetic acid, cannot be considered as inactive, or as mere menstrua, since, by the same process to which the drug is subjected, the virtue of the substance, improperly termed by him unmedicinal, will also be developed, particularly as it is known that these substances are not simple or elementary, and, as he himself believes, that all substances are, more or less, compound. Moreover, we must remember his explicit suggestion, (see Chron. Dis. Vol. I. p. 209) that it will not be wrong if still smaller doses are chosen, since "it is impossible to give them too small"—also quite a novelty in regard to the human intellect as well as to all experience, as no one can well imagine a power which can never decrease too much, for counteracting, with equal strength, every degree of resistance. Notwithstanding, Hahnemann says, page 213 of the same volume, "whoever will not imitate it exactly so, (!) will leave unsolved this greatest problem of "the art; he will leave the most important long lasting diseases as uncured, as they "were before my doctrine appeared. If it is not done punctually (!) nobody can "boast of having followed my advice and expect any effect!" After some of his disciples had publicly confessed that they were frequently unsuccessful in curing diseases, since it was impossible to cure the disease by homœopathic doses, though the drugs were selected according to the prescriptions of homœopathia, (see, for instance, according to Dr. Kopp, l. c. Dr. Hartmann, in Archiv. of Hom. Heilk. Vol. VIII. No. 2, p. 36), the medical pope emitted a warning bull from his capitol at Cœthen, enjoining his faithful followers "not to disgrace themselves by mixing any "allopathic treatment whatever, but to execute the divine homœopathic art pure and "sincere." (See according to Kopp. l. c. Archiv. f. h. H. Vol. IX. No. 3, 1830.—We are told by trustworthy men, that if patients apply to him after they have followed the advice of some of his disciples without relief, Hahnemann, with the greatest indelicacy attributes their failures directly to their ignorance and carelessness. Patients not relieved by his own treatment, seldom return to him on account of the excessive fees which they are obliged to pay, *in advance*, to his door-keeper before they are even admitted; one louis d'or is the least. If the patients submit, and continue to complain about the failure of his medicines, for which they are also obliged to pay very high prices, he ascribes it to medicinal influence, to which they must have absolutely been exposed, or to a neglect on their part, &c. until they become tired and apply to allopathists. Hahnemann's common-place explanations to his infatuated patients, are said to be sometimes exceedingly ridiculous. We find many specimens of that kind in his works. Thus, in proving the validity of his maxim, similia similibus curantur, by burns cured with alcohol or spirits of turpentine, which he likewise inconsistently places at once among his *homœopathic* doses; he applies it to politics, saying, (see Mat. Med. Vol. II. 2nd ed. pp. 18 and 19), "and thus we find the great truth confirmed by many "daily occurrences, that nature" (now so beneficial!) "intends to deliver mankind from "its wearisome evils by very similar short ones. Nations, sunk for centuries in grovelling apathy and base slavery, elevate their minds, become sensible to their human dignity, and again free, after being trodden by the tyrant of the west into dust." We cannot explain this sentence of the "great genius," which is probably considered by his followers as the resumée of the greatest philosophical sagacity and Sterne-like wit—otherwise, than that he thinks, if a people is long trodden into dust, an immense virtue becomes doveloped, in the same manner as if a grain of flint was rubbed down with sugar of milk in his mortar. It seems singular, however, that this great politician considers an army of 300,000 well armed and disciplined men, with some hundreds of cannon, coming from the west, a homœopathic remedy, to excite, by a salutary counter-and-after-operation, a quick, safe and durable cure.—Deplorable and high-spirited Poland, why didst thou not elect Samuel Hahnemann thy general en chef!—

In respect to the "unheard of niceties," of homœopathia, we must observe, that never since the healing art has existed, have all drugs been considered to be equal in strength. The greatest quack has thought proper to give different doses of different drugs, as some may be administered by drachms or ounces, and others only by grains, or even small portions of a grain. Much less would a well educated physician consider it a trifle to prescribe opium, belladonna, strychnine, &c. as he would Epsom-salts, rhubarb, althea, &c. without minute regard to the small fractions of a grain. If he, for instance, prescribed $\frac{1}{24}$th part of a grain of strychnine, or $\frac{1}{48}$th part of a grain of the arseniate of potassa, the ratio of one grain to these fractions is respectively, in the first instance, as twenty-four to one, and in the latter, as forty-eight to one. He will also considerately pay due regard to the age, the sex, the constitution, &c. of the patient, and will increase or diminish the dose accordingly. We may suppose that, whenever a judicious physician should wish to administer a dose of such drugs to an infant, he will reduce it to the one hundredth part of a grain, where, of course, the ratio is as one hundred to one. But Hahnemann assigns no reason why the virtues of his drugs begin to be developed only at the eighteenth dilution, and continue so until the thirtieth, without a proper scale of progression, or without any regard to the particular circumstances just alluded to; he formerly allowed his followers to choose, ad libitum, between the eighteenth and thirtieth dilution, that is, between a dose of one with sixty, and one with thirty-six zeros, since this is just as correct, according to the elements of allopathic arithmetic, as that the ratio between one-fourth and one-twelfth, is as twelve to four, or as three to one. If by the development of the drugs the virtues decrease, then the ratios can be made inverse, and the ratio of the dose formerly recommended by Hahnemann, is, to the dose prescribed afterwards by him, as one with thirty-six zeros is to one with sixty. To say nothing of our earlier demonstration, that, in the very sense of this doctrine, the homœopathic doses must not be considered as very small, but as immensely large, it is evident, that as all magnitudes are merely relative and not absolute, and depend therefore on their ratio to other magnitudes; in the case before us, the immense difference of the number one with sixty zeros, and one with

only thirty-six zeros, or the absolute number of one with twenty-four zeros, is a mere trifle in the eyes of the same men, who assert that their opposers pay no regard to minutiæ.

Hahnemann suggests no caution in regard to sex, age, &c.; he also is, and ever will be, unable to give a minute scale of the different degrees of his dilutions or developed powers, even in round sums of millions, billions, &c. and much less in their intermediate quantities, which must naturally exist, if the least regard be paid to such important conditions. Supposing the power to be developed only at the eighteenth dilution; if it increases, it does not increase from its first outset by jerks, but, as all powers in nature do, by a gradual and uninterruptedly continued progression; there must, therefore exist, relatively, an immense number of developed virtues between the eighteenth and nineteenth, between this and the twentieth dilution, and so forth, which Hahnemann would have recommended for the circumstances named, if he could give his doctrine any consistency. The total disregard of these intermediate doses, and still more the transition from the administration of one drop of any dilution, to the mere smell of a pellet moistened with the same dilution, where evidently the quantity of the developed virtue applied becomes incommensurable, prove the vagueness of all things connected with this doctrine.

No reasonable cause or experiment can be assigned, which can explain why the same process, eighteen times repeated, developes no perceptible power, but if the same process be continued, the power becomes immensely developed in the compound ratio of the dilutions by hundreds of drops and by the shakings made; nor why in this respect all substances are alike, however different they may otherwise be, as, for instance, arsenic and table salt; nor also why the doses of these medicines are not affected by the differences of sex, age, &c.; is it not impossible to imagine, how any product of two factors can remain always the same, when one of them is considerably changed, or both are altered disproportionately!—Even if Hahnemann had never explicitly claimed, that the operations of his developed drug-virtues were always absolute, unconditional, and the same under all circumstances, in opposition to the changeable miserable vital powers, these assertions would, merely from this extraordinary disregard of all circumstances, considered by all men so important, follow as a matter of course. In Vol. II., page 15, of his Chronic Diseases, Hahnemann prescribes 200 sugar-pellets to

be prepared by a confectioner, from *one* grain of starch and sugar; in Vol. IV. page 338 of the same work, 300 from one grain; in his Organon, 3d edition, he orders 100 sugar-pellets to be moistened with one drop of the developed solution; in the fourth edition of the same work, §283, he prescribes 300 sugar-pellets, to be moistened with the same;—here the ratio varies from one to two and three. In the same manner he advises that *two or three* sugar-pellets of the same weight and equally moistened should be given, if one should not appear sufficient; as if his developed virtues were like the common orders of physicians, who prescribe one or two table-spoonfuls of a medicine, or from one to three pills, &c. not aware that his advice at once reduces the immense ratio which exists between the 18th and 30th developement of his atoms, or between one and one with 24 zeros, to the ratio between one and two or three!

In his Organon, §278, page 194, he says, "so powerful is the "development of the innate virtues of drugs, not thought of before "my time, that in later years I have been forced, by convincing "experiments, to reduce the ten shakes, formerly prescribed to "be made after each dilution, to two."—Here we would, ask and with reason: what part does the shaking take in the homœopathic development of drug-virtues? Why must the dilutions be repeated separately so many times, if the shakings are so important, and why cannot the number of dilutions be less, and be replaced by a proportionately greater number of shakings; so that the first dilution, made by twenty or forty shakings at once, with or without a proportionate quantity of a non-medicinal substance, should be exactly equal to the ten or twenty dilutions each, made with two shakings only? How can the same drugs, which Hahnemann considers to be so different in their action on the living human body, that they make many different drug-symptoms; how, we say, can these drugs be considered so physically alike, that the virtues of arsenic and nux vomica, of flint and table salt, &c., are all developed equally and to the same degree,(potenz) by the same number of shakings, though again, a few shakings more or less are considered so immensely important? If there be such a great difference between the present and former number of pellets made from one grain, and between the shakings formerly prescribed by Hahnemann and those he has lately resolved upon; how many patients of Hahnemann and his followers then have been sent to their long homes, by a treatment

formerly proclaimed infallible, with the same bold and impudent charlatanism, as the improved mode is now recommended! However partial any one may be to this doctrine, infatuated homœopathists excepted who reject even mathematical certainty, nobody can consider these different and grossly contradictory statements of Hahnemann, other than as the most absurd falsehoods.—Those who implicitly believe in miracles and witchery, who divest themselves of all dignity and of the noblest prerogatives of intelligent beings, by worshipping such a fool or impostor as Samuel Hahnemann, those solely will admit, that a power developed from a substance might operate with great violence, if taken in the many thousand billionth part of a grain only in excess, but that nevertheless the degree or potenz of a power twice or three times stronger, developed from the *same* substance, by the *same* process, might be given under the *same* circumstances without injury, nay! with the greatest and most durable benefit, in allowing the use of two instead of one sugar pellet. Reader, when such men as Dr. Hering tells you, (see Concise View, page 11,) "But Hahnemann was as "little confounded as was Fulton. For it is indicative of great "minds undauntedly to persecute a noble design, in defiance of the "whole world; the great idea becomes as it were an element of "their souls;" forget for a while that one of your countrymen has lent his pen to translate such stuff, and take a slate and pencil to compare these our statements, faithfully extracted and translated from Hahnemann's works, with any thing in the world, and you will easily find that they are much more nonsensical, than if a lunatic should assert, that all the gunpowder which has ever existed and now exists, is insufficient to blast a large rock, but that this may be done very easily by a power developed in this singular manner from one grain of it, whilst the power developed by *exactly the same process* from *two or three* grains, or a much larger quantity of *the same gunpowder*, would make but little difference, and would not move an ounce of any additional resistance or weight from its place! If you can comprehend this, then you may, when sick, confidently smell of a sugar-pellet moistened with the thirtieth developed virtue of flint or table salt; then you may sip with delight the homœpathic chocolate. Who would not again exclaim with us—"Helleboro "opus est!"—but in large allopathic doses.—"Multa cernunt arus- "pices; multa augures provident; multa oraculis declarantur; multa "vaticinationibus; multa somnis; multa portentis."—*Cicero.*

In accordance with reason and experience we may therefore assert, that the homœopathic doses and the developed drug-virtues are *absolute nonentities*. Hence we cannot wonder, that not only the statements of Hahnemann's opposers, who have either themselves tried homœopathic prescriptions, or have seen them tried by homœopathists, but also those of honest homœopathists, who were cautious not to deceive themselves and the public by withholding the truth, in secretly using allopathic medicines and doses,* vary very much from the presumed infallibility of this method. Besides the many instances which we have already stated, and the frequent retractions and changes of Hahnemann himself, which we have quoted from his works, Dr. Gross, one of Hahnemann's disciples, and one of the first and most distinguished champions of homœopathia in Germany, complains very much, (Arch. f. h. Heilk. vol. viii. no. 3. p. 9. according to Dr. Kopp, l. c.) that the *long time* required for homœopathic cures, may be considered as a great inconvenience. The same periodical, devoted solely to the extension of homœopathia in Germany, contains many statements where homœopathic physicians have been compelled *to recur to allopathic treatment.*

To say nothing more of the humbugs and falsehoods published by bare-faced homœopathists, though notoriously contradicted by their own brethren, diseases like intermittent fevers, generally so easily and safely cured by the physicians of any good school, are confessedly treated on the homœopathic method without success, by Drs. Gross, Rummel, and Hauptmann, all of whom are distinguished homœopathic practitioners and authors; though these diseases, and their similarity with the symptoms of the drug-disease produced by Peruvian bark in healthy persons, must be considered as the very matrix of all the monstrous and abortive productions of Hahnemann and his doctrine. The same is stated publicly by other homœopathists, in regard to pulmonary consumption; though Hahnemann considers it so easily, quickly, and safely curable by the potenzised virtue developed from tin. In a manner very unusual for him, though he could not well evade

* The Berlin Medical Gazette for 1832, and other German medical periodicals, contain many such instances; and in some cases also physicians, who pledged their faith to their patients strictly to follow the prescriptions of the new healing art, either proved by their recipes, or have avowed to us, that they commonly use allopathic doses. The inconvenience of combining allopathic practice with homœpathic principles has already been stated, as leading to the rudest empiricism.

it when introducing his "great truth" about the itch, he states candidly, (Archiv. f. h. H. vol. viii. no. 3. p. 97, according to Kopp, l. c.) that in inveterate chronic diseases the treatment may last, on an average, *from one to two years*, before the cure may be expected. Soon after he confesses again, in his last work, (Chron. Diseas. 1828, vol. i. p. 5 and 6. that the homœopathic mode of treatment pursued by him hitherto, (that is, from 1805 until 1828) in conformity with the "law of nature!" *has failed in all chronic diseases of any importance*, (to whom is a disease not important?) syphilis excepted, though this mode had been *used long and with the greatest exactitude*, and though the patients themselves had also *faithfully observed the minutest prescriptions*, strict diet, etc. only the commencement of the treatment proved satisfactory, but the progress to recovery less so, until at last *all hopes of recovery disappeared*." And he continues in *precisely* the following words: "The frequent relapses made at last the best selected homœopa-" thic remedies and the most appropriate doses the more useless, "the more they were repeated: they at last scarcely afforded any "relief whatever."—All these statements he made a few years after his declaration, so often repeated by himself and by all his adherents and admirers, (for instance, Mat. Med. 2d edit. 1824, vol. ii. p. 26. when he was already eight years in full labour with his "great truth;" and in his Organon, §§ 19, 65, and 156, according to Kopp, l. c. p. 287.) that "nobody will be cured from "his disease by any other but the homœopathic method, in an easy, "quick, and safe manner."

We must remark, that these confessions of Hahnemann and of his most devoted disciples were made when he, as we have seen, insisted upon the observance of strict dietetic rules, by which alone many of their patients have recovered. As Hahnemann, in the last edition of his doctrine, remits to his patients a large part of his former dietetical prescriptions, we may expect from him, in future, much less favourable reports, in regard to the frequency of his safe, quick, and durable cures, provided he lives long enough in "his youthful vigour," to benefit the world with another "great truth," by which he will be forced again to repeal and retract some more of his infallible precepts and statements.—Minute dietetical directions have been formerly the only and truly beneficial part of the homœopathic practice, and must have cured many

who had long suffered from a rude treatment, which, disregarding the great influence of many habitual and congenial agents, considered, next to the lancet, large bottles and boxes of medicine its only resource; rational medicine, however, has never regarded strict diet as consisting solely in starvation, as Dr. Hering (C. V. p. 26) states: but in a proper selection and quantity of food, drink, exercise, etc.; a few obstinate chronic diseases of the reproductive system excepted, where starvation must be recognised as the greatest remedy.

Hahnemann being, as it appears from vol. i. p. 189 of his Chr. Dis. much annoyed by the reproaches of his opposers, who attributed the recovery of some of his patients solely to his strict dieting system; and many patients having become tired of abstaining for years from their usual pleasures and comforts, he has resolved to insist no longer upon these measures, which he formerly thought so indispensable. Dr. Kopp, (l. c. p. 157) states, that most of his homœopathically treated patients objected to the severe dietetic prescriptions, though he could not dispense with them, being the most essential part of the homœopathic treatment. The strict diet must have been, moreover, too redolent of rational medicine for Hahnemann, and particularly unimportant to him, who was unwilling to share with any thing the merits of his discoveries and the unconditional salutary operations of his developed drug-virtues. —Reflecting patients, treated by homœopathists, and knowing that they received only one atom of a drug every four or six weeks, which was considered fully sufficient not only to combat a long and serious disease, but also to counteract all external influences of nature, of the mind, and the many other vicissitudes of life, must also have thought it strange, that the restrictions from their usual innocent habits, nourishment, etc. provided these were not particularly noticed as remedial substances, should be so necessary in support of the operations of atoms, said to be omnipotent; they must also have known the many facts acknowledged by rational physicians, that serious diseases sometimes disappeared and were radically cured by a proper diet, without any medical assistance. Hahnemann, whose confidence began to decrease since he published his work on Chr. Dis. and his false prophecies about the Asiatic cholera, was therefore anxious to give a new impulse to his doctrine, by making his treatment more palatable to his pa-

tients: hence he and his faithful adherents now released their patients from the inconveniences of a strict diet; the *remedial agents* excepted, particularly when these are required to play their part as scape-goats.

Hahnemann's constant exertions to discredit and reject all experience hitherto valued by the medical profession generally, though he himself adhered to the rudest allopathia for the greatest part of his professional life, are very remarkable, and may offer to the impartial observer additional proofs, that his object is not love of truth and humanity, but only petty egotism. What otherwise could have made him, as we have seen, so opposed to the use of all external remedies; not only of bleeding, leeching, cupping, but also of blistering, injections, remedial baths, ointments, cataplasms, etc. and even of the most important and indispensable surgical operations; as for instance, the aid of surgery for hernia inguinalis, fistula ani, etc. etc. The admission of these remedies would evidently not have curtailed the merits of his doctrine, and would have been more worthy of a reformer of the healing art, who is termed, by his missionary in the new world, "the first physician who recognised it as indispensable in every disease, to "regard man as a whole."

Hahnemann's course appears still more absurd, if we read in §§ 287, 288, 289, and 290 of his Organon, (4th edit.) among similar correct remarks:—"Each part of our body, if possessed of "the power of feeling, can receive the influence of medicines and "communicate their powers to all the other parts;" and "even "those parts which have lost their proper sense, for instance, "the tongue and palate, which have lost their taste, the nose which "has lost its smell, impart the power of medicines not less com-"pletely to all the other organs of the body. Even the external "surface of the skin is not insensible to the reception of remedies, "especially of liquid ones," etc.*

"The rogue and fool by fits are fair and wise." Singular enough! that here likewise this extraordinary man is so adverse to truth and common sense, that he cannot conceal his anxious desire immediately to retract and to annihilate any truth which may involuntarily have slipped from his pen, for he states on the same page, that the resorption of mercury from frictions with mercurial ointment is very doubtful.—Is that doubtful which has been daily confirmed for centuries, by innumerable instances! how does mercury enter the system of nurses, who have merely attended patients salivated by mercurial inunction? Such cases are known to many, and have occurred und r our own observation. Is this metal, which so many times is distinctly found in the large masses of saliva, ejected by salivation from mercurial inunction, and which, as trustworthy observers report, is even found in the blood and the bones of such patients, perhaps in Hahnemann's eyes, merely a fiction of the "overrefined" chemists?

We always considered the use of external remedies, even before the endermic method was known, as so highly important, that in general we would rather renounce all internal than all external remedies. Many diseases of the reproductive, and especially of the lymphatic system, when the functions of the digestive organs are disturbed, and cannot bear medicine, as calomel for instance, without difficulty, or with still greater injury, are only to be cured by the external use of mercurial ointment, or similar medicated baths. Hopeless cases of scarlet fever, the most dangerous affections of the brain after external violence, in typhus fever, in hydrocephalus, etc. are cured by cold infusions, and by applying coverings of pounded ice to the head; not to mention the indispensable use of bleeding, leeches, injections, blisters, etc.—Since the endermic method has been adopted by the profession, the value of the external application of medicines is recognised still more and promises the greatest results. If we consider that by this mode the functions of the stomach, digestion, etc. which it is so important to preserve in most diseases, are no longer disturbed by medicines, and that these are reciprocally not so much changed in their chemical properties and effects, by the action and influence of the digestive organs and all the different mightily decomposing digestive juices; we may justly expect from this method much greater and also materially different results in the operation of drugs upon the human body; for the skin, as an excretory and assimilative organ, is, next to the lungs, the most important to the human economy; and being so extensive and so rich in lymphatic vessels, nerves, etc. it receives, more than almost any other part of the body, the greatest variety of immediate impressions from abroad.

We should think that these considerations would have been much more important to Hahnemann and to his adherents, than, comparatively, to other professional men, if the former were really anxious for the improvement of the profession, as they would open to them a new and interesting mode of testing the correctness of the homœopathic maxim, similia similibus curantur, by using endermically simple drugs for experiments on healthy persons. But no! our new prophet Samuel is worse than Mahomet, since the latter has, at least, acknowledged other prophets; whereas the former regards every thing not conceived by his morbid fancy and not hatched by his miserable charlatanism, as false and worthless.—

Thus he ridicules and despises also the use of the most powerful and salutary drugs, for which the profession is so highly indebted to modern chemistry, such as quinine, morphine, strychnine, etc. saying explicitly, on § 269 of his Organon, 5th edit. that "to use "them is foolish, unless it is intended to destroy quickly the lives "of men and animals."

Instead of directing his attention to the homœopathic use of the large stock of valuable drugs, which the profession already possesses, he has attended particularly, either to substances hitherto considered by all chemists and physicians as destitute of remedial properties, such as flint, sepia, etc. or to those useful only for domestic purposes, as table salt, or also to those deservedly considered as obsolete, such as Drosera rotundifolia, Thuya occidentalis, &c.— This singularity becomes still more evident, when we compare, in his Mat. Med. and Chr. Dis., his trials with drugs, considered by the physicians of all ages as the most powerful and efficacious, with those newly introduced and picked out by him, from ancient and obscure authors on Materia Medica. Thus he mentions only sixty symptoms of drug-sickness produced by Rhubarb, seventy by Digitalis, one hundred and seventy-five by Camphor, one hundred and thirty by Iodine, seventy-five by Stramonium, four hundred and thirty by Arsenic, &c. but from his particular drugs, as Silicia, five hundred and sixty-five, Lycopodium eight hundred and ninety, Charcoal nine hundred and thirty, Table Salt eight hundred and ninety-five, Sepia one thousand two hundred and forty, and from his old pet and scape-goat, Belladonna, one thousand four hundred and forty.—Had he really intended to promote medical knowledge and truth for the benefit of his fellow-men, and not merely for his miserable vanity and vile interest, he would have attended to the drugs in general use, and suggested a better mode of employing them, to prevent many mistakes, so murderous in his eyes; this course would have afforded him and his followers a field of investigation, much more ample and honorable than that of hunting after new drugs, which will never be wanted, or which are employed so seldom, that they are not even mentioned in most pharmacopœias; as, for instance, Acetate of Manganese.

But Hahnemann and his followers cry, facts! facts! and Dr. Hering also exclaims, with his usual pathos, on the last page of his panegyric, "The Americans demand facts, and on these we "can confidently and securely rest for our support." With this implicit reliance upon facts only, it must appear very strange that

the same author has reserved for his never-failing new healing art, in the cunning manner of his party, some very large allowances in regard to some individual cases, which may prove unfavorable to his homœopathic treatment, remarking that " the new healing " art is not to be judged by its success in isolated cases only, but " according to its success in general, its innate truth and the incon- " trovertible nature of its fundamental principles." It appears, indeed, very singular, that the same man, who denounces in the most wanton and assuming spirit and language of his master and brethren, all theoretical reasoning in medicine, and even rejects as " learned lumber," all medical theories suggested previously to his new professional creed, speaks, in the same breath, of *innate truth* and the *incontrovertible nature* of its fundamental principles! Any one who reads this and similar expressions, interspersed at random for the edification of those, who either do not understand, or do not confine their attention when reading such a pamphlet, would really think that homœopathia rests more on the principles and dictates of the human understanding than any other conjectural doctrine whatever, nay! on the certainty of mathematical calculation itself, and that henceforth, if men die before the age of eighty, unless killed by accidental violence, it will be only because they did not apply in time to a faithful homœopathist, or because this one has made some gross error in consulting his drug-and-disease-symptoms-dictionaries.

Having attempted to examine wherein the *innate truth and incontrovertible nature* of Hahnemannism consists, we would humbly ask the author of the Concise View and his brethren, if the public is told not to rely on *isolated cases* with regard to their new healing art, but only on its *success in general;* in what manner this success in general could be *incontrovertibly* ascertained or substantiated, when they decline to stand the test of isolated cases?— It may justly be expected, that men who, with their implicit faith in their master's dictates, believe with him, that *before homœopathia existed, among hundreds of patients, only one was cured by his good fortune;* that men who worship tenets, opposed to all the laws of the human understanding and of nature, as oracles; who deny all facts acknowledged for upwards of 2000 years, although they are confirmed by every physician of only a moderate practice, &c., should feel particularly obliged *to prove* their general success. If homœopathists object to many reasonable customs and usages, and substitute for them " unheard of

"niceties," they will nevertheless hardly succeed in changing the old custom, that in equity, the accused party cannot be their own judges, and that the veracity of assertions is not to be decided merely by those interested in them, but by judges, witnesses and umpires, who shall weigh conscientiously all the facts and circumstances of the case.

In our humble exertions to vindicate our native and to benefit our adopted country, we feel particularly entitled to ask for the valid testimonies of a *general* success of the homœopathic treatment, as we have sufficiently proved that the statements of its success in Europe, made in this country, are incorrect; and that their authors, if not intentionally, certainly from party spirit and from want of sufficient information, substitute for truth their implicit faith and their extravagant fancies and hopes. It would be exceedingly difficult for homœopathists to prove the general success of their method, even if many of the largest hospitals had been attended exclusively by homœopathists for at least twenty-five years past; but to our knowledge, there exists not the smallest public hospital in the whole world, which is partly and much less exclusively confided to a homœopathist.* Many distinguished

* Since the above lines were written, we have seen a prospectus for publishing, by subscription, the library of homœopathia, signed by Dr. Hering and J. G. Wesselhœft of Philadelphia, and a supplement of these proposals by Dr. Ch. F. Matlack of the same city. It was to be expected that the author of the Concise View, which had at that time already been published in Philadelphia, for about nine months, without being duly noticed by the profession, would persuade himself that his pamphlet enjoys general approbation from the American public, and would persevere in his usual manner to say summarily, that his new art of healing continues rapidly to spread over the whole of Europe, and particularly of Germany; without referring to any other authority than to the few obscure men of his party. But we could not have expected that the American champion of homœopathia, not satisfied with the aid he has offered to the admired doctrine by his translation of the Concise View into his native language, should follow the same course in communicating statements to his countrymen, which he can only know from hearsay, and which he is unable to support by any reference to creditable public documents. It is true that a small homœopathic hospital has recently been establishedat Leipzig; but as far as we know, not at the expense of any public authority, as Dr. Matlack appears to believe. About 2000 dollars had been collected from his friends and disciples, for its erection, in the year 1829, at the celebration of the 50th anniversary of Hahnemann's graduation. Up to the end of March, 1832, there had been received 34 patients in all, of whom 20 had been cured, 1 died, and 13 remained under treatment, according to the statements of the hospital physicians, published in the Jahrbuecher der homœopathischen Heil-und Lehr-Anstalt zu Leipzig, No. 1. That it is a private hospital is also evident by Dr. Matlack's own statement, that it is supported by the voluntary contributions from patients restored to health by the new art. Whoever knows the condition of Germany, and especially of Leipzig and its neighborhood, in regard to public benevolent institutions, will not believe that patients, who had to pay heavy fees for treatment, would after their recovery contribute to a private institution, which the poor do not want on account of the excellent and large public hospitals provided for them. Would Dr. Matlack, when joining perhaps with some of his colleagues in establishing a private hospital for about a dozen patients yearly, think that it will offer to the public satisfactory evidence of the general

medical authors, and among others Dr. Stieglitz, in his late work quoted above, have remarked, that it never has been minutely ascertained by unquestionable facts, what medical system, school, or method of treatment, has proved to be the most successful in curing diseases; still of course, every general mode of medical treatment, whether based on a distinct theory or not, from Hippocrates, Galen and Paracelsus, down to Brown, Broussais and Hahnemann, claims to be more successful than all others. Though we have proved by their own statements, that in many diseases homœopathists are less successful than other practitioners; although, in self-puffing, some of them excel even their illustrious master; still, if we would allow them to be relatively more successful than others, they could not satisfactorily substantiate the same by facts, until the procentages of recoveries by all the other methods are exactly ascertained; and as this has hitherto been impossible, or neglected, of course all the preferences claimed for homœopathia, as well as for any other method of medical treatment, must remain vague and undetermined.—A few voices from the tombs would soon settle all these professional controversies; but as they will forever remain dumb, there is no other mode of determining this important point,

success of homœopathia? Still more void of all truth is his statement, that the medical staff of the Prussian army is partly composed of a numerous body of homœopathic physicians. It may be, that some few individuals of this corps, which stands high in the profession, secretly adhere to this medical superstition, but we can positively assert, and challenge the author and all his homœopathic brethren to prove the contrary, that in all the lectures and examinations in the Prussian universities, as well as in its military medical schools, not the slightest regard is paid to homœopathia. All the distinguished professors, chief surgeons and physicians in Prussia, publicly ridicule homœopathia, whenever they have opportunity to do so, as might be expected from men so well educated. This may be proved not only indirectly, by Dr. Hering's exceedingly ridiculous lamento, in his Concise View, that "the kings and princes of Europe "impede this new art by processes, penalties and even bayonets," but also by the Berlin Medical Gazette, Horn's Archiv. and other German periodicals. It is likewise an error, that the King of Prussia has ordered that homœopathia should be freely practised in the alms-house at Berlin; because, to our knowledge, no such explicit direction has ever been published, and the large hospital, la Charité, but not the alms-house at Berlin, is still the place where poor patients are treated; the public reports of the former however, contain not the least account of homœopathia. The latest regulations of the Austrian government again forbid homœopathia to be practised in the army, after the trials publicly instituted at Vienna proved abortive, as we have stated above.—We hope the publication of the complete library of Hahnemann's works may succeed. Nothing would more contribute, if they are faithfully translated, to do justice to our statements and remarks respecting this new art of healing, its author and his followers, and to open the eyes of the profession as well as of the enlightened people of this country to this subject; though, in our opinion, there are very few, if any, medical works, from which the medical student, the practitioner or any one might not extract ten times as much good information as from all Hahnemann's works together, the useful warning excepted, which they richly offer, showing how far men, who claim the confidence of the public to their professional talents and care, are led astray from all common sense, in neglecting and despising the safe ground of human intellect and experience.

except to try for at least twenty-five years all diverse methods of medical treatment, particularly those emphatically recommended by the framers of new medical systems, in the same manner as homœopathia was tried for a short time in a military hospital, by order of the Russian government. The governments of populous countries ought also to demand yearly from each physician, a minute report of his treatment in each case, with a detailed statement of its result; they also ought to inquire minutely by what mode, and by what physicians, those have been treated who died, without any previous violence,* under seventy years of age. Should such a course be enforced, and faithfully pursued for about fifty successive years, and its results be published frequently, with the strictest impartiality, after being canvassed and reviewed by distinguished medical colleges, then, but only then, could we conclude with some degree of probability, which method was relatively the best, or rather which has proved to be the least detrimental.† Single facts have been and will ever be considered by the mass of the people as the strongest arguments in regard to professional acquirements, as well as to arcana or quack medicines. The economy of the living human body, its multifarious natural dispositions, the great variety and number of changes in

* To the weekly reports of deaths in every large city or county, containing the different names of diseases, should be added, if not the names of the attending physicians, (which might perhaps cause a very beneficial competition;) at least, the method of treatment in short scientific terms; thus for instance: scarlet-fever or belladonna-sickness treated by a homœopathist, gastro-enteritis by a Broussaisist, &c.

† We say explicitly, "with some degree of probability," under the impression that, if medicine is not void of all certainty, the best method of treatment must finally become evident by the improvement in the healthy condition of those persons, who punctually follow the advice of their physician in regard to the prevention of diseases, and also by the relative majority of quick and durable cures, especially if the medical practice is founded on rational physiological and pathogenetical principles. With the latter restriction, individual cases cannot offer any argument in respect to the acquirements and talents of a physician. The greatest quack may cure patients, and the most learned and talented physician may lose some;—non est in medico semper relevetur ut æger.—Many methods of medical treatment, however, the leading principles of which are less rational, frequently prove, by the natural talent of the physician, provided he is well educated, more beneficial than more rational principles without the natural talent of the physician; homœopathia excepted, which is, as we have endeavoured conclusively to prove, nothing but the utmost methodus expectativa, or the pure self-treatment of nature in diseases. It is not the system, method or school, which forms the good physician, but his general good education, his zealous love for truth, his philanthropical devotedness to his vocation, and particularly his natural talent, by which he will know best how to manage and to improve every method or system, or rather by which he will best understand how to use or to reject them altogether; a mode which, in the healing art likewise, cannot be taught, but depends on an innate disposition, which embraces many peculiarities.—Galen says therefore, very correctly, "multa sunt in praxi, quæ nec dici nec scribi possunt;" and the expression, "medicus nascitur" is no less correct than the old proverb, "poëta "nascitur."

its conditions, the still greater multiplicity of all external influences upon body and mind, the immense multitude of various combinations of all those single influences, &c. will naturally produce an immense variety of cases, all of which differ, more or less materially; and if the most active physician should live thousands of years, each hour might present to him new cases, in which he could not honestly predict, with *certainty*, the beneficial or detrimental result of a certain treatment, or of a definite drug.

Hence every enlightened physician will candidly confess, that the results of his exertions are uncertain, and excepting the absolute action of a poison, there is no treatment, no substance or drug, which will certainly cure a patient, or which, if constantly applied for a length of time to many, suffering by similar or widely different diseases, would not allow them to recover, (post hoc;) nay! would not in some cases even promote a radical cure, by what we must term in consequence of our confined means for minute investigation, chance, (propter hoc). This accounts for the long continuance of so many prejudices and errors with professional and unprofessional men, and for the singular fact, that people, be they ever so much enlightened and cautious against impositions, when not guarded against such injuries by the wise laws of a good medical police, continue to pay high for all kinds of quack medicines. We may justly suppose that, unless the latter proved beneficial in some cases, people would certainly not continue to use them, notwithstanding the tricks of the venders. Forced to resort in many cases to quack-medicines, in consequence of the bad state of practical medicine, and of the charlatanism of many ignorant doctors, the people are well aware that the medicine recommended for cases, frequently so palpably different, is like a chance in a lottery, in which blind accident only throws out "to a few individuals the prize, but to a "thousand the blanks," (see C. V. p. 28); do they not however often purchase blanks of physicians at much higher prices?

It is too important not to repeat it here again: can a reflecting public consistently confide in a treatment called methodical, if the same remedies are prescribed in the same order from beginning to end, in cases and under circumstances widely different; if they see their doctors depend upon certain empirical rules for all cases, or follow the prescription of their text-books more anxiously, and without regard to individual circumstances, than an intelligent tradesman would follow the rules of his trade? Must it not be evi-

dent to all judicious men, that they run much less risk of being sacrificed, or of suffering their strength and constitution to be broken, when they leave nature to herself or take an innocent quack medicine, than when they are, by an orthodox medical doctrine, or by a rude empiricism, first reduced to the utmost by bleeding, leeching, cupping, blistering, vomiting, purging, &c., and afterwards, when almost unable to digest the mildest food, are pampered with quinine, bark, opium, &c., or perhaps subjected to hazardous experiments with strong doses of such drugs, as prussic acid, iodine, strychnine, &c. Who can prove to them positively which system or method of medical treatment offers the least number of blanks in proportion to the prizes? Will, or can veracious homœopathists candidly secure to them prizes only? How can this be, if they themselves refer not to individual cases, but to general success, which they are, and will ever be unable to prove? Does the author of the Concise View really think, that his repeated assurances, for instance on page 25, "injury cannot indeed result from a false selection; for "it is soon to be discovered, and is free from all dangerous conse- "quences to the patient," or when speaking of homœopathic doses, on page 28, "When no relief whatever is possible, they do no in- "jury," &c., will or can make a favorable impression on any person of sound judgment? If he and his brethren discard all negative injury, or the natural consequences arising from neglect, the common sense of others will nevertheless consider it as highly important. No vender of a quack-medicine would assert, if he understands his business, that it *never* injures but is *always* beneficial, because, in doing so, he might expect that idiots only would purchase his stuff, since most people would judiciously conclude, that what can never do harm can also do no good. Such outrageous puffs will be ineffectual with Americans, and may be told more successfully to the inhabitants "of Egypt, the land of monsters, and of the "sanguinary gold-coast."—"The American people demand facts," but certainly very different ones from those which homœopathia can offer, especially when its high-gifted adepts renounce the test of individual cases, and advert to the investigation of "its innate "truth, and the incontrovertible nature of its fundamental prin- "ciples." We have not the good fortune to be a native of this our adopted country, but we think "the Concise View" to be any thing but courteous to this free and happy nation, since all its features appear more calculated to infatuate an uncivilized and superstitious

people, than to make a dignified impression upon the countrymen of a Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and so many others, whose brilliant talents and characters reflect the greatest honour on their country. If the Americans should be contented with mere facts, without investigating whether these facts are only accidental, without any relation to, or dependence upon, some existing cause, (statements sensu latiori); or without relying upon causes, as the necessary conditions of definite facts, (species facti, or facts sensu strictiori), they would be as credulous and superstitious as all uncivilized people are; they would have remained satisfied with those objects only which nature has granted them, and would continue to be tributary for what the skill and talents of other people offer them. But as they have long since emerged from this state of infancy, and have attained the vigour of manhood, they are not contented with naked facts only, but are anxious closely to examine the different causes from which the true one is to be selected; desirous to ascertain the real connexion between causes and effects, they prefer rational investigation to a rude senseless empiricism, in order to become, as far as possible, disenthralled from the chances of accident, and to derive, from the same cause, all other effects which its nature admits. In consequence of this rational course adopted by the Americans, they have devised a plan for atmospheric electricity to pass down their dwellings without injury; they have shortened the intercourse between distant places to a degree which would have appeared to our ancestors as a vision, and advance daily in a manner almost unparalleled in the numerous branches of industry and commerce. We confidently trust, therefore, that, some doctors excepted, not one American will henceforth be duped by homœopathia, after becoming more intimately acquainted with the bearings of its maxims, and the superstitious features of its practice. People, deficient in common sense and education, or otherwise disposed by their morbid fancy, to credulity and superstition, may be dazzled by emphatic references to facts, and may, when gazing at the ascent of a balloon or a feather, consider it as *a fact* contrary to the laws of gravity! fools may be imposed upon with the painted dial of a hollow plaything, when told that it will be as useful as the best timepiece, because it is *a fact*, that both coincide together 732 times in one year, at the minute and second;—a ratio which is much greater than many rude medical treatments or the use of

quack-medicines will prove to be in proportion to their failures: lunatics only will believe, if a mosquito lights on a rock, weighing millions of pounds, and this rock falls to the ground, that the mosquito caused its fall!—Reader, you scorn or smile at these extravagant comparisons! take a slate and a pencil, and the most simple arithmetical calculation will prove even the latter of these instances to be a million times more entitled to probability, and, therefore, also, to the term *fact*, than that the thirtieth homœopathic dilution of flint, table-salt, arsenic, &c. or that even the 1500th dilution of sulphur would affect in the least any mortal being upon our planet!

With reference to these remarks about the reliance upon "general success," we do not for a moment doubt that many patients will recover *after* a faithful homœopathic treatment, and that, at the next anniversary meeting of the respected homœopathic society at Philadelphia, the duly verified reports of many marvellous cures performed by homœopathists, will have arrived from all quarters of this country likewise, and even of cases where persons have been rescued from the very verge of the grave by this new art of healing.* We confidently expect, that, in general, more patients will be *permitted to recover* by this mode, than by many other methods of medical treatment hitherto pursued by some doctors. Many patients will be negatively saved by it, whose constitutions are strong enough to combat the disease itself, but not the additional consequences of a medical ill-treatment, generally ten times worse than the disease.† The negative beneficial results of the homœopathic treatment will be still greater in countries, where

* Our anticipations expressed at the beginning of this year have not been realized. The first anniversary of this "beneficent society" passed over, at least without any literary eclat, strong enough to extend beyond the walls of the meeting-place of the homœopathic propaganda there. We eagerly expect the second anniversary, when the whole number of all the miraculous homœopathic cures in the new world will be reported to the public.

† Every honest physician will candidly confess, that in many cases, nature left to herself, restablishes even patients, considered as hopeless by them, and that often when he followed one of his colleagues in attendance, and credit was given to him for the cure, it belonged much more to the well directed measures of his predecessor than to him, who only quietly awaited the effect of medicines given before. As a very striking instance of the advantages of the methodus expectativa, we remember a physician of immense professional learning, but who had not the judgment indispensably required to manage the extraordinary means afforded to him by his diligent researches, which were most favorably seconded by an almost unparalleled memory. In consequence of his incapacity to select from the stock of his knowledge the means proper for the individual case, he at last prescribed in all cases, almost nothing else but some gruel of salep-root, arrow-root, &c., acidulated with phosphoric, or some other acid, and only differently colored by some other innocent ingredients. He however cured many patients, and enjoyed great confidence in his extensive practice; especially because he, though very restricted in his judgment, was considered to be an extraor-

human life is every moment at stake, from the bad state of pharmacy, and the legal irresponsibility of the apothecaries, by which the best prescriptions of the well educated and judicious physicians are frustrated, and even frequently rendered highly detrimental. In this respect we are zealous advocates of homœopathia. Our remarks about homœopathic doses show that, whatever may be the bearings of its other maxims, it is utterly foolish to think, that all the homœopathists who have existed, now exist and may exist, even if the world should be blessed with them for many centuries to come, could do the least injury to any man, provided they follow strictly the tenets and prescriptions of the third maxim of their doctrine. The eighteenth, and still less the thirtieth dilution of any known drug, simple or compound, selected homœopathically, enantiopathically, allopathically, or empirically, be it Arsenic, Strychnine, Bohon upas,&c., or a mixture of these strongest poisons, would probably injure no living creature on our globe, from the Mastodon, if it still should exist, down to the smallest microscopic infusory worm or insect, unless the latter might, perchance, be drowned in the drop of liquid dilution, as in so much water or milk. Hanging the term HOMŒOPATHIA, written in the same form as the charm ABRACADABRA,* round the neck or elsewhere, will

dinary wise man, by his ability to use exactly the printed sentences and words of the many works which he constantly read ; and because also he judiciously avoided all controversies about abstract subjects. This and other similar men, remind us of the late distinguished member of Congress, John Randolph of Roanoke, who on once hearing one of his friends say of a man, justly celebrated as the greatest polyhistor of this country, "there goes the American encyclopædia;" replied, "ay ! but it has lost its index."—Such men are as necessary in the sciences, as laborers are for the architect, they facilitate much the endeavors of truly talented men to promote the different branches of sciences to which they have devoted themselves—as physicians they mostly injure, likewise only negatively, or by neglect. They deserve all, when departed from this world, the known witty epitaph, "Hic jacet vir summæ memoriæ, judicium expectans."

* The history of medicine (see Curt Sprengel's and Hecker's works mentioned above) ascribes the origin of this charm to Basilides, a heretic, who communicated it to Serenus Samonicus, father and son, who lived in the third century, under the emperors Geta and Alexander Severus. One of the two Samonici wrote a book in verses, containing medical precepts, under the title, "*De Medicina parvo pretio "parabili.*" He expresses his prescription for the use of the Abracadabra, in the following hexameters ;

"Inscribes chartæ quod dicitur *Abracadabra*,
"Sæpius et supter repetes, sed detrahe summam,
"Et magis atque magis desint elementa figuris.
"Singula quæ semper rapies et cetera figes,
"Donec in angustum redigatur littera conum ;
"His lino nexis collum redimere memento :
"Talia languentis conducent vincula collo,
"Lethalesque abigent (miranda potentia) morbos."

This superstition was intimately connected with a belief in the curative and protective properties of certain precious stones or gems, called *abraxas* or *abrasaxas-stones*, in Æons, Dæmons, and in magic formulæ or figures, (termed by Plato, σχηματισμοί) which were considered as protective against all kinds of diseases, dangers, &c.

prove just as useful in curing *all* diseases, safely, quickly and durably, as was that superstitious formula, which was, however, merely thought salutary in intermittent fever, and a few other complaints. And indeed if any government should resolve to expel all physicians, as we are erroneously told by some uncourteous authors the Roman government once did, all faithful homœopathists may justly claim to be exempt from such a barbarous ordinance.

If therefore, these pages have no merit in any other respect, we deserve at least full credit from the homœopathists for having proved, as we flatter ourselves, with artless but strict conclusiveness, that as ACTIVE *physicians, they are the most harmless men in the world.*—But if common sense proves that, as medicine has existed for centuries and still exists, it is based on truths, which have stood and will stand the tests of reason and experience, in spite of all the encroachments of credulous superstition and cunning quackery, then it will also be evident that many cases require the assistance of those great means, which merciful Providence reveals to man, whenever nature herself is either not powerful enough to remove the disease, or is inclined to injure or to destroy the patient.

The positive injury ascribed to allopathic medicines by Hahnemann and his followers, and the avowed harmlessness of their mode, may prove the true value of the former in comparison with the indifference or nullity of the latter; since it must be evident to every impartial man, that any thing in physical nature, which can injure, may, if properly applied, be highly beneficial, and vice versa. Hence, according to their own verdict, we may justly charge homœopathists with the very grave sins of omission, as we have tried to acquit them of all acts of positive commission. We must either deny the occurrence of many cases where the life of a patient is exposed in a few hours, or even moments, to the greatest danger, from which he may be easily rescued by proper aid; or every body who believes that we must wait for the effect of medicine for weeks and months, must also admit that such a mode will frequently produce great and irreparable injury from omission. What, for instance, would a red-hot homœopathist say in his defence, if in a severe case of hæmoptysis, the patient expires by suffocation in less than an hour, and he has neglected to prescribe the proper remedies recommended by the profession; and instead of large bleed-

ings, epispastics, injections, &c., all neglected by him as external remedies, and instead of the beneficial use of dry table salt by tea-spoonfuls, which he considers an allopathic remedy, and also as "a crude article, possessed of a prejudicial character," (see Concise View, page 14,) &c., he has administered the thirtieth dilution of an antipsoric remedy, and intended to repeat this dose after four or six weeks, when the counter-and-after-operation of the first dose has ceased? How can he justify his conduct, if instead of protecting a man from the danger of a strangulated hernia inguinalis, by a good truss and other judicious prescriptions, he recommends him to smell every four or six weeks of a sugar-pellet, moistened with the thirtieth developed virtue of another antipsoric; while the patient dies miserably by his implicit confidence in such horrid madness? What can he proffer for his excuse, if in a severe contusion of the skull, the patient expires, because the homœopathist has neglected proper aid, and instead of the most effectual and indispensable internal and external remedies, such as large abstractions, cathartics, &c. cold fomentations and even trepanning, he has only administered now and then an atom of Arnica? And thus in hundreds of cases, the homœopathist, with all his contempt of "learned lumber," with all his "unheard of niceties," with all his emphatic proclamations of "no error is possible," "injury can "indeed not result from a false selection," &c., will be the negative cause of fatal cases, or of the long sufferings of a broken constitution, perhaps never again to be restored. We have witnessed some of these shocking cases, where men in the prime of life deplored too late their deception and folly.*

* We have recently seen an extensive report of many trials with the homœopathic method in different diseases of horses and dogs, made at the veterinary school and hospital of Berlin, in presence of many students, and with the utmost exactitude; even homœopathists assisted at these experiments, and the drugs were prepared by them. According to this report, contained in the Berlin Medical Gazette, 1834, No. 14, these trials were instituted on account of the brilliant statements of many homœo-and-isopathic cures of horses and dogs, lately published by Dr. Lux, (English, Lynx,) veterinary surgeon at Leipzig, in the first volume of his work, "Isopatik der Contagien, &c. "or Zooiasis," "oder die Heiluug der Thiere nach den Gesetzen der Natur, (English, the cure of animals according to the laws of nature.)" Though the cases were selected at Berlin, similar to those of Dr. Lux, *not one of them was cured*; *not one confirmed* the correctness of his statements *even in the slightest degree.*

We have also read the report of the celebrated Dr. Andral, respecting many experiments with the homœopathic method, publicly instituted by him, with the greatest exactitude, at the hospital "*la Pitié*" at Paris. *They likewise proved quite abortive*, (see Bulletin General Therapeutique, May, 1834, and United States Medical and Surgical Journal, No. V., December, 1834.)

The homœopathists will probably say, that Dr. Andral has not talent enough to

We invite the attention of our indulgent reader, finally, to the following extract. Samuel Hahnemann, whose sensible remarks we are as anxious to quote, as we are his ravings, says also very judiciously, on pages 11 and 12 of Vol. II. of his Materia Medica, 2d edit., that if the symptoms of a disease have disappeared *after* the use of certain drugs, or the patient has recovered *after* them, it does not follow that *they have caused* it to disappear; and farther, contradicting in like manner his own assertion so many times repeated in his works, he says, on pages 14 and 15 of Vol. III. of the same work—"Is it not very foolish to ascribe "the consequences to one power, while powers of another cha- "racter were co-operating, which often principally, though jointly, "aided in producing the effect?" If we refer minutely to these suggestions, which, if impartially applied to *the results* of all the tenets and prescriptions of homœopathia hitherto known, would deprive them altogether of their value, being at least much too premature; and if we combine them with the bold assertions of Hahnemann, frequently cited, that among some hundreds of patients, hitherto and now treated on the allopathic mode, *only one* has sometimes recovered by mere chance; we may ask every impartial umpire, what entitles him voluntarily to select from the records of medicine some scattered cases in support of his doctrine? and farther, what reason has he to preclude from his mode likewise the chances asserted to prevail in all other modes?

Hahnemann, in ascribing to himself the discovery of the homœopathic action of simple drugs on the human body, and in asserting that none but *his* prescriptions admit positively a radical and safe cure, has of course precluded all other physicians before him from his discovery, and from all belonging to it. Abstracting,

ascertain the "*law of nature*" and the "great truth" as well as they and their brother homœopathist, the *sugar-refiner* so quickly made a *doctor*, and that the distinguished professors at the celebrated veterinary institute at Berlin, had also not the proper "*lynx-eyes*," to distinguish the symptoms in diseases of horses and dogs, since they only understand also, when animals, "exactly and expressly define the seat of every "symptom, &c. all the circumstances under which any complaint arises or disappears, "increases or diminishes, &c., emotions of the mind or mental expressions, &c; "sensations of falling asleep, during sleep and on awakening; even the dreams and "the kind of them," &c. (See Concise View, pages 21 and 22.)—If every physician in the world should forget his sacred duty, and on exposing his patients to the dangers of such foolish experiments should find them incorrect, nay! if even Galileo, whom they graciously admit as one of the few competitors of their great genius, (see Concise View, page 16,) should rise from his grave, and fully explain to them the nonsense of their law of nature, &c. they would reply—"and yet it is true."—The negro can be *allopathically* white-washed, more easily than they can be cured of their folly.

therefore, from the many other objections which we have inferred against the quotations of homœopathic cures, as made before him by men who were unconscious of his fundamental "law of nature," similia similibus curantur: how could he quote those instances in his behalf, as he cannot name *one* single case among all those quoted, in which the supposed homœopathically acting drug has been used after his mode, and in which all the restrictions and conditions, asserted by him to be indispensable, have been observed?

Considering, therefore, that the salutary issue of the homœopathic mode is likewise not quite precluded from mere chance, of which we may be convinced by the fact, that many also have recovered from external and internal diseases, who were so fortunate as to possess neither an allopathic nor a homœopathic doctor;—and admitting that, among some hundred patients treated by allopathists, *one* only escaped by chance; it is obvious that the number of patients who have so escaped during many centuries, when compared with the number of patients treated by all homœopathists during the period of their existence as practitioners, which is less than twenty years, even admitting that they have not lost one patient, would show it by far more probable that the homœopathic cures were made by mere chance, than the allopathic ones. If therefore Hahnemann and his followers should still admit, that allopathists cure only one among some hundred patients, they will all have to practise at least for about a century longer, without ever losing one patient, before they can free their cures from the equitable reciprocal reproach of mere chance, and before they can justly appeal to the *general result* of their miraculous and infallible medical treatment! How much less can homœopathists free their fortunate results from the reproach of being caused by mere chance, if they avow, as we have seen, that their mode of treatment frequently fails, and a few excepted, none among them would be impudent enough to assert, that he has never lost *one* patient, but by external violence or from old age. Our study of homœopathia has made us so familiar with large numbers, that we will try, from motives of curiosity, to elucidate this assertion likewise by some arithmetical calculations, whereby we will grant to the results of the homœopathists the most liberal, and to those of all other physicians the most unfavourable proportions.

The population of Europe amounts to 189 millions; say of Europe and America together, 200 millions. Suppose, on an average, that there is one physician for every ten thousand people, there would be twenty thousand physicians. There are unquestionably more in America alone, if we consider the large number of those graduated annually, and that New York, with a population of 240,000 inhabitants, has more than 400 physicians. Now admit that every physician cures, only by chance, one patient among 200, he requires 2000 patients yearly to cure only ten a year: in one century, therefore, the 20,000 physicians will, at this rate, have cured 20 millions; and in less than half the time that the healing art has existed, or in ten centuries, 200 millions. If there are 1000 homœopathists, (there are certainly not so many, and not 100 who follow faithfully this doctrine) who at the same rate permit all their patients to recover, that is, 2000 each, their number will amount, in ten years, to 20 millions; and they could not, in less time than a century, begin to prove their mode of treatment not to depend upon the same chance which they ascribe to other modes. But it is generally considered a very unfortunate medical practice, if in one hundred patients ten die. The incurable Asiatic cholera even destroyed only $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. at the highest average;*—2000 patients leave, therefore,

* The United States again gloriously excepted!—We have already stated above, that a North American homœopathist has cured all his six hundred patients, who came under his treatment, after the beginning of September, 1832. An allopathist, Dr. David M. Reese of this city, was not less fortunate, according to a letter written to Dr. Nathaniel Porter, professor of the theory and practice of physic in the University of Maryland, and published in U. S. Med. and Surg. Journal, Number V. Dr. R. states, "During the year 1832 I attended 432 cases, (of asiatic cholera) all "of which were treated upon these general principles,"—(repeated bleedings by pounds, calomel by drachms, and ice at pleasure)—"varying according to the circum-"stances which, more or less, modify every case; and of this number I lost but nine, "every one of whom, in my own opinion, died for want of blood-letting, the time for this "operation having passed before I saw them."—Who will doubt, if among 432 cases of Asiatic cholera only nine have died, and that every one of the latter would have been cured, had Dr. Reese been called early enough, that all the world is very much mistaken about this disease, if they consider it so dangerous. It will appear even less dangerous than a catarrh, (which sometimes may change into a fatal bronchitis, encephalitis, &c.,) to the physicians in all other quarters of the globe, as soon as they have learned this infallible mode of treatment.—Dr. Reese, who ridicules all opinions about the contagion of Asiatic cholera as fancies, has seen his treatment confirmed in the much milder epidemic of this year, having lost but three of 101 patients; of course by the same reason as quoted above in regard to the nine deaths. Our German professional brethren will be much amazed at these brilliant results, which they could not attain. We cannot conceive why (according to the public reports) this year so many have died from the Asiatic cholera as it has been much milder, and as those splendid results of a treatment, *so settled* by this uncommonly talented and happy practitioner, have been known to the medical profession of America since the last epidemic; for, if he himself could not attend to all cholera patients, his respected colleagues, in New-

at least 1800 cured in one year by one physician; or 20,000 physicians will cure, in ten centuries, 36,000 millions of patients.—Admitting, therefore, even that five times as many, or 98 out of a hundred patients of homœopathists recover, and that, from the present moment, every physician should become a faithful homœopathist, almost a whole century must elapse before the general result could be incontrovertibly proved to be in favour of homœopathia, if its votaries insist upon the ridiculous and contemptible assertion, that of 200 allopathic cures only one succeeds by chance.

The real great truth, indirectly advanced by the homœopathic doctrine, consists in clearly demonstrating the ample means which nature possesses to cure many and even dangerous diseases in man also, if left undisturbed and without any interference whatever; and that therefore many cases, requiring the assistance of the healing art, may be cured much quicker and safer when physicians do not consider large doses of powerful drugs and an heroic method of treatment, always absolutely necessary.—Putting out of view that no physician would obstinately pursue a mode of treatment which, in all, or at least in most cases, would prove immediately noxious, we would act as partial and unfair towards homœopathists, as Hahnemann does in regard to all allopathists, if we should question for a moment the honesty of all of them, and the truth of all their statements. Be the number of patients suffered to recover by homœopathists ever so small, a great truth could be derived from these cases, which would prove highly useful to many physicians of our time, if they were not in favour of a fanaticism, much more noxious than the playthings of a faithful homœopathic treatment. Many would be convinced, that thousands who might have recovered, *after*

York at least, would have been anxious to pursue such a simple mode of treatment! We cannot understand also, what the meaning of Dr. Rees's restrictions can be when he says, "treated upon these general principles, varying according to the cir-"cumstances," &c., since the conception of *general principles* would unquestionably dictate, in many cases, a very different and even opposite treatment; the fact, that he would not certainly abstract three pounds of blood from an infant child, nor administer to it sixty grains of *calomel* pro dosi, does not, however beneficial it has proved to be, exculpate this mode from being merely an empiric one. If both, the American homœopathist and allopathist are correct; and who dares doubt it!—how immense is the difference between a dose of the thirtieth developed virtue of camphor, copper, &c., and repeated doses of forty grains of calomel, &c.—Sed patet immani, et vasto respectat hiatu!—*Lucr.* What can better prove the benevolent provision of nature, in protecting life from the danger which naturally must arise in some cases, from one or the other of both so diametrically opposite modes of treatment!

merely smelling of a moistened sugar-pellet, have fallen victims, or escaped from death with a ruined constitution, by the prevalent nonsensical opinion, that the only true guides of the physician are symptoms and the results of post mortem examinations; or by the dominant prejudices, that every disease must be a genuine inflammation, a plethora, an accumulation of bile, etc. and that therefore the blood, this very essence of animal life, and its noblest secreted fluids, are to be abstracted by repeated large bleedings; the sordes must be evacuated by large doses of calomel, cathartics, etc. until all vital reaction, termed by them inflammatory excitement, becomes extinct!

Many rude empirics, who now scoff at homœopathia, merely from self-conceit, without any further investigation of it, would perhaps, on a nearer acquaintance with some of its facts, pause, and cease to drug their patients with large doses of powerful medicines, and would soon become sensible, that it is still better to adopt whimsical drug-symptoms and virtues, than either to combat causes which are only supposed to exist, or if they exist, rudely to destroy the substance and resources of life simultaneously.—They would scoff not less if they were told, that an extended *medical* practice among all classes of people was conducted upwards of thirty years, at least with results not less fortunate than those they claim, almost without bleedings, without spoonfuls of calomel, without large doses of opium, morphine, etc. and nevertheless, this fact is true. Hence it is evident, that they must either assert, with the homœopathists, that all they prescribe can never do any harm if it does no good; or if they derive their fortunate success from their active mode of treatment, they must consistently admit, that many of those patients, who recovered *without it*, would have been materially injured *by it*. To be sure, they could in return reply, with the same consistency, that many who were saved by their partial and active treatment, would probably have died without it. But we should think, that a medical treatment, which regards minutely the great variety of the diseases of all the systems and parts of the human body and the various and important atmospherical and other influences, which confidently trusts to the great assistance of the vital powers, &c., must appear more accordant with the laws and processes of living nature, and must therefore generally prove more salutary, than a partial and rude medi-

cal autocracy!—We should also think, even supposing the numbers of cures and failures to be equal on both sides, and they certainly are not, that it is still better to run the chance of letting the patient die, than of killing him.—Physicians who attribute the recoveries of their patients to their mode of treatment and skill, and all their failures to mere accident, will never become conscious of their errors, and never improve in their profession: it is principally the school of misfortune which makes wise men wiser; that physician only who soon forgets his cures, and remembers his failures, will improve in knowledge and talent, though much grief is added by this to his tiresome and arduous vocation.—Should it be sufficient for medical practice to brandish the lancet and to administer empirically some dozens of remedies, then anatomy, physiology, chemistry, etc. with all their collateral sciences, are also merely ornamental to allopathists, as they are to homœopathists; and we may justly presume, that no patient exists, who, knowing the bearings and probable consequences of both, would not judiciously prefer a homœopathist, if he should require the assistance of a physician.

The neglect of philosophical study, and of the treasures contained in the writings of the great physicians of past ages, which, combined with the progress of modern anatomy, physiology and chemistry, would have highly elevated the profession of our times, has paved the way for homœopathia. Conscious of this fact, let us thankfully acknowledge the consequences which even this unparalleled superstition has indirectly promoted, and all the blessings of rational medicine will be again secured to mankind. Rational medicine has always acknowledged, and truly learned and talented physicians have always observed, that the smallest dose of any medicine may be sometimes too large, and the largest too small, provided that the limits of both are not imaginary, but marked by the laws of nature, by experience and common sense. The salutary use of mineral springs, which frequently contain only very small quantities of medicinal substances, have attracted for many centuries the reflections of the judicious physicians in regard to the efficacy of small doses; and severe chronic diseases, especially those which, idiopathically or sympathetically, affect the organs and ganglions of the abdomen, have often been cured with small quantities of digestive salts, emetic tartar, calomel, &c., by which, probably, in the center of the animal functions, a series of salutary *living* electro-

chemical processes is excited and entertained—We think that the great discoveries in modern chemistry, especially those belonging to the processes last mentioned, will promote still more the exhibition of reasonably small doses of medicines, particularly in cases which are not urgent; and we are confident and hope that, in this way, medicine will soon be greatly and beneficially reformed. We regret that this reform will be delayed by the discredit which must follow homœopathia, as soon as its true bearings are generally known.

Were it possible to prove incontrovertibly, that one single case has ever been cured *by*, and not merely *after*, the thirtieth developed virtue of any substance or drug, no apology whatever could be devised for the medical profession, if it should hesitate forthwith to adopt homœopathia. None more than ourselves would then humbly acknowledge our deceptive prejudices so long entertained, and none would be more willing than ourselves, to atone amply for the injury done, perhaps, in these pages to homœopathists and their doctrine, by our misled zeal for truth and the welfare of our fellow-men.—As a physician, we must then hail such a state of things, by which, in the words of the ingenious and learned author on demonology and witchcraft, "the ordinary laws of nature were occasionally sus-" pended," though we could not consider it a blessing for mankind to attain even the greatest age by homœopathia, if, as would be the case, the foundation of reason and experience, in medicine as in other sciences, is destroyed, and a new era of supernatural powers and miracles is opened. But until then, we will likewise faithfully adhere to the other judicious expression of the same celebrated writer, viz. "Each advance in natural knowledge teaches us, that "it is the pleasure of the Creator to govern the world by laws, "which he has imposed, and which are not in our times interrupted "and suspended."

We devoutly confess, that we must admit much that we cannot comprehend, and we are fully convinced, that if our knowledge could be many billion times greater than it is, we would, however, be still conscious that it is by far too little, distantly to comprehend the fundamental law of nature, and still less, its eternal first cause. —Medicine particularly has been, and always will be, more uncertain and more subject to the influence of erroneous hypotheses, than most other conjectural sciences, because in animal, and particularly in human life, the physical powers of natural appear connected with, and modified by, the laws of a higher and very dif-

ferent order of things; to these we feel that we particularly belong in the few fleeting moments, when the abstracted mind seems disenthralled from the sway of physical nature, and becomes conscious of its future better home. It is owing to our total want of a clear conception what life itself is, and wherein it essentially consists, that the healing art, more than any other, alternately advances and retrogrades, and that, notwithstanding the greatest discoveries and experiences made in it, one age bequeaths to another its self-created or inherited superannuated errors and prejudices under the cloak of truth. But, nevertheless, rational medicine, called by Hahnemann allopathia, can justly boast of truths which have stood the test of upwards of a score of centuries, and will probably remain unshaken for ages. Every honest physician, whose interest is not merely confined to the bedside of his patients, but who is zealous for truth, and fully aware of the destination of his arduous vocation, will feel himself in duty bound to defend the tenable ground which Providence has granted to the human intellect, and to the noblest exertions of the really high-gifted benefactors of their race, against the encroachments of any superstition and credulity. This defence, however, will in medicine also be successful only by the great advantages which true religious devotion, the means of an ample philosophical education, assiduous study and true love for that vocation offer; but not by a doctrine like Hahnemannism, which despises all the laws of the human intellect and of nature, which substitutes for rational medicine the products of a morbid fancy and the rudest empiricism which ever existed; and which, as it admits of no cause which is not visible or palpable, would even not allow the existence of a God.

If in doing so, with consciousness of our faithful exertions for truth and philanthropy, we should once become sensible of our long cherished errors and mistakes, we will candidly confess them; and when we arrive at the great cross-way which separates the twilight of our earthly existence from the brightness of eternal truth, we may quietly exclaim with Laplace, the Newton of the nineteenth century, when breathing his last:—"all we know is "very little; but all we do not know is immense."

Dr Tutor
7 Bishopsgate St
opposite the London